IRISH 1798 COLLECTION

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
Boston Public Library

https://archive.org/details/unitedirishmenth05madd

THE
UNITED IRISHMEN
THEIR
LIVES AND TIMES

Lady Pamela Fitzgerald and Her Children

From an Engraving by Scriven, after the Celebrated Painting by George Romney

THE
UNITED IRISHMEN

THEIR LIVES AND TIMES

BY

RICHARD ROBERT MADDEN

M. D., F. R. C. S., M. R. I. A.

NEWLY EDITED

WITH NOTES, BIBLIOGRAPHY AND INDEX

BY

VINCENT FLEMING O'REILLY

NEW YORK
THE CATHOLIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY
OF AMERICA

56719 5

THE SHAMROCK EDITION

This edition is strictly limited to one thousand numbered sets, and is sold by subscription only.

Number 313

Copyright, 1916, by
THE CATHOLIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY
OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

PAGE

The Wearing of the Green ix

LORD EDWARD FITZGERALD.

Chap. VIII. Betrayal of Lord Edward . 3
Chap. IX. Death of Lord Edward . . 22
Chap. X. Attainder of Lord Edward . 47
Chap. XI. Madame de Genlis 64
Chap. XII. The Origin of Pamela . . . 82
Chap. XIII. Marriage of Pamela . . . 97
Chap. XIV. Career of Lady Edward . . 119
Chap. XV. Death of Lady Edward . . 138

REV. WILLIAM JACKSON 162

THOMAS ADDIS EMMET.

Introductory Notice 191
Chap. I. Early Life 195
Chap. II. Folklore of the Emmets . . . 200
Chap. III. T. A. Emmet's Studies . . . 224
Chap. IV. Connection with United Irishmen 243
Chap. V. Compact with the Government . 261

ILLUSTRATIONS

Lady Pamela Fitzgerald and Her Children *Frontispiece*
After the Celebrated Painting by Romney.

PAGE

New Ross 82
After the Original Drawing in the Possession of the Editor.

General Lake 162
From an Engraving by P. Lightfoot.

Mrs. Jane Patten Emmet 192
From a Painting by Mrs. Elizabeth Emmet Leroy.

James Napper Tandy 242
After a Painting by J. Petrie, in the Family Gallery at Johnsbrook, Ireland.

THE WEARING OF THE GREEN

VERSION BY DION BOUCICAULT

"The Wearing of the Green," may be considered the best of Irish street ballads, in fact, a writer in "The Athenæum" in 1887 described it as the "finest street ballad ever written."

According to the "Treasury of Irish Poetry" (N. Y. 1900) the version there given dates from 1798 and should not be attributed to Boucicault. This is the version we have selected and in giving credit to Boucicault we do so on the authority of a letter contributed by him to "The Freemans Journal" (Dublin), December, 1868; "When '*Arrah-Na-Pogue*' was produced in London the following song was sung by *Shaun the Post.* I have been frequently urged to sing it during my late engagement at the Theatre Royal, but in view of the political excitement agitating the country at this moment I declined to do so. The last four lines of the first verse belonged to an old Dublin street ballad. These stirring lines inspired me to complete a national song called 'The Wearing of the Green.'

"These words sung nightly at the *Princess Theatre* in London and in the great cities throughout England and Scotland, have been greeted by all classes with unmistakable sympathy, the applause being as deep as it was fervent. For the moment at least, these multitudes were Irishmen.

"Yours very truly,

"DION BOUCICAULT."

Another verse has since been added to the two here given, but by whom is unknown.

Recently in "The London Daily News" the claim was made that the melody to which this ballad is sung, was of Scottish origin. However, Dr. Grattan Flood, says in correction, that the air is of undoubtedly Irish origin and was given by the actor Macklin to his daughter who sang it in 1757 in Smollett's only successful play "The Reprisals."

Boucicault, the author of this generally accepted version was born in Dublin, Dec. 26th, 1822, and died at New York, Sept. 18th, 1890. As a dramatist he was known on both sides of the Atlantic. He composed, or adapted over three hundred plays, prominent among them being "London Assurance," produced in London in 1841 when he was only 19 years of age; "Old Heads and Young Hearts" (1843); "Colleen Bawn" (1860); "Arrah-na-Pogue" (1865) and "The Shaughran" (1874).

Oh Paddy, dear! An' did ye hear the news that's goin' round?
The Shamrock is by law forbid to grow on Irish ground!
No more St. Patrick's day we'll keep, his colour can't be seen,
For there's a bloody law agin' the wearing of the green.

I met with Napper Tandy, and he tuk me by the hand,
And he said, "How's poor ould Ireland and how does she stand?"
She's the most disthressful counthry that ever yet was seen,
For the're hangin' men and women there for wearing of the green.

Oh, if the colour we must wear is England's cruel red,
Let it remind us of the blood that Ireland has shed;

WEARING OF THE GREEN

Then pull the Shamrock from your hat and throw it on the sod
And never fear, 'twill flourish there, though under foot 'tis trod'.

When the laws can stop the blades of grass from growin' as they grow,
And when the leaves in summer time their colour dare not show,
Then, I will change the colour, too, I wear in my caubeen,
But 'till that day, plaze God, I'll stick to the wearing of the green.

THE
UNITED IRISHMEN
THEIR
LIVES AND TIMES

MEMOIR OF LORD EDWARD FITZGERALD

CHAPTER VIII

BETRAYAL OF LORD EDWARD

THERE can be little doubt but that the person who disclosed the secret of Lord Edward's place of concealment, was one then in his confidence, or in that of the persons about him who were in the habit of visiting him at Moore's, Cormick's, or Murphy's, or forming what was called his "body guard" when he went abroad.

From some persons in the confidence of Lord Edward or his friends, Sirr's information was certainly derived, which led to the knowledge of Lord Edward's intended visit to Moira House on Usher's Island, and the fact with regard to Murphy's house, that there was a valley between the two sloping sides of the roof of the adjoining store of that house, which required to be particularly looked after. The very moment of Sirr's arrival there, on the evening of the 19th of May, the identical valley where Lord Edward had been concealed only some hours before by his host Murphy, was pointed out by the major to his assistants as a place by which escape was likely to be effected.

The circumstance of the rencontre in Bridge-

foot Street, the previous evening—of Sirr and his party being there on the watch for Lord Edward, knowing he was to pass through the street on the evening in question, is a sufficient proof that treachery was nearer his person while in concealment, than he or his friends had any idea of.

The narrative of Mr. Murphy is a sufficient evidence of his fidelity to render any vindication of it unnecessary.

The son of Mr. Reynolds has very industriously endeavoured to impress the readers of his book with the opinion that there were a variety of circumstances, so suspicious in their nature, in the conduct of Murphy on the occasion of the arrest of Lord Edward, as to be totally inexplicable. In short, he plainly insinuates, though he does not say it in express terms, that Murphy was privy to the door being left open, by which Sirr and his party gained admission, and as he was standing at the window when they entered, that he must have seen the party in the street on their arrival at the house.

If Mr. Reynolds's father had been living, he could probably have informed him that there was not the slightest ground for these insinuations; though the disclosure of Lord Edward's place of concealment was not made by him, from his subsequent intimacy with the agents of government, he could hardly have been mistaken as to the

quarter from which it did come. The person who gave that information was amply rewarded for it—he received £1,000, and the initials of his name were not those of Nicholas Murphy. Nor was Murphy at large when the payment was made. The following date, letters, service, and sum paid for it, show the groundlessness of the suspicions entertained by Mr. Reynolds:—

"June 20th, 1798. F. H. Discovery of L. E. F. £1,000."

These initials may spare the friends of Samuel Neilson the trouble of vindicating his memory, if the third edition of the "Life of Lord Edward Fitzgerald" has left any necessity for so doing. The imputation on Neilson of being the betrayer of his friend, had no foundation whatsoever. It is only to be regretted that a doubt ever existed for a moment of the conduct of a man who suffered so much in purse and person as Neilson had done, for that cause in which his dearest friend perished, and for whom he risked his own life in the prosecution of a daring, though ineffectual, plan for his liberation.

In the third edition of Mr. Moore's Life of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, he has inserted an introductory notice respecting the misinterpretation of the passage which had given uneasiness to the friends of Neilson, and its omission in that edition.

Lord Edward was arrested at Murphy's on

the 19th of May. Neilson had dined there in company with him that day, and after dinner somewhat abruptly left the house. Shortly afterwards, Major Sirr's party entered the house, finding the door open. Whether Neilson shut the door on going out or not, is unknown. He had been at the house in the morning, warning the servant to keep "a sharp look out," as the military were in the neighbourhood searching Moore's house, as he believed, for Lord Edward. The probability is, that when he suddenly left Murphy and Lord Edward in the evening, his fears of the military being still on the alert, induced him to go out to see if all was safe in the vicinity, and most likely with the intention of returning. Whether he had time to return before Sirr's arrival, or met with some acquaintance, who drew off his attention from the object of his going forth, we have no information. In any case, his imprudence cannot be denied; but I can safely say, that none of those who were best acquainted with him suspected the sincerity of his attachment to Lord Edward, however imprudent his conduct may then have been. At that period his health was shattered: both mind and body were broken down by the effects of long suffering during his protracted confinement, and, finally, by an indulgence in those baneful habits which are so easily acquired—at first, embraced for the sake of the forgetfulness of care and

trouble, and which at last, confirmed by long indulgence, enslave the mind. Neilson was first arrested in Belfast, the 15th of November, 1796; sent up to Dublin, and kept in close confinement till the month of February, 1798; he was then liberated on account of severe illness, from which he was hardly expected to recover.

The 20th of April, in company with Mr. John Hughes, he visited Lord Edward at Cormick's in Thomas Street, where he was then in concealment. In the report from the Committee of Secrecy of the House of Lords, 1798, on the examination of John Hughes of Belfast, it is stated by the latter, that he went to Dublin on the 20th of April, and remained there about nine days. He called on Samuel Neilson, and went to Cormick's, where he found Lord Edward playing billiards with Lawless, and dined there with them.

About the 28th of April, he breakfasted with Neilson at the house of Mr. Sweetman, who was then in prison. Neilson then lived at his house. Neilson and he (the same day) went in Mr. Sweetman's carriage to Mr. Grattan's, at Tinnahinch. He states that Neilson and Grattan had some private conversation, and after some general conversation about the strength of the United Irishmen in the north, they left Mr. Grattan's, and on their way back, Neilson informed him that he had sworn Mr. Grattan.

On the 14th or 15th of May, Neilson and Lord Edward rode out to reconnoitre the approaches to Dublin on the Kildare side: they were stopped and questioned by the patrol at Palmerstown, and finally allowed to proceed.

Four days after Lord Edward's arrest, Neilson was arrested by Gregg, the jailor, in front of Newgate, where he had been reconnoitering the prison, with a view to the liberation of Lord Edward and the other state prisoners; a large number of men being in readiness to attack the jail, and waiting for Neilson's return at a place called the Barley Fields.

It is then evident, that Hughes was in the full confidence of Neilson, the 28th of April; there is no reason to believe that he ceased to be so previously to the 19th of May; and yet, during this period, and long before it, there is very little doubt that Hughes was an informer.

Neilson's frank, open, unsuspecting nature, was well known to the agents of government, and even to Lord Castlereagh, who was personally acquainted with Neilson, and on one occasion had visited him in prison.

Hughes, it is probable, was set upon him with a view to ascertain his haunts, and to enter into communication with his friends, for the special purpose of implicating Grattan and of discovering Lord Edward. That his perfidy never was suspected by Neilson during their intimacy, there

are many proofs; and still more, that Neilson's fidelity to the cause he had embarked in, and the friends he was associated with, was never called in question by his companions and fellow-prisoners, by Emmet, M'Neven, O'Connor, etc.; or, if a doubt unfavourable to his honesty was expressed by John Sheares in his letter to Neilson, wherein he endeavours to dissuade him from attacking the jail, it must be considered rather in the light of an angry expostulation, than of an opinion seriously entertained and deliberately expressed.

This man, John Hughes, previously to the rebellion, was in comfortable circumstances, and bore a good character in Belfast. He kept a large bookseller's and stationer's shop in that town.

In his evidence before the Lords' Committee of 1798, he gives an extensive account of his career as a United Irishman.

That portion of Hughes's evidence which has reference to Lord Edward Fitzgerald, is of such a nature as requires that it should be given without abridgment, as it appears in the report:—

He went to Dublin on the 20th of April, and remained there about nine days. He called on Samuel Neilson; walked with him to Mr. Cormick's, a feather merchant, in Thomas Street. He was introduced by Neilson to Cormick in the office. Cormick asked them to go up stairs; he and Neilson went up stairs, and

found Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Mr. Lawless, the surgeon, playing billiards. He had been introduced to Lord Edward about a year before by Teeling; he was a stranger to Lawless; so he staid about an hour; no particular conversations; was invited to dine there that day, and did so; the company were Lord Edward, Lawless, Neilson, Cormick, and his wife. The conversation turned upon the state of the country, and the violent measures of government in letting the army loose. The company were all of opinion that there was then no chance of the people resisting by force with any success. He was also introduced by Gordon, who had been in Newgate, and Robert Orr, of Belfast, chandler, to Mr. Rattican, the timber merchant at the corner of Thomas Street. Rattican talked to him on the state of the country and of the city of Dublin, and told him that they would begin the insurrection in Dublin by liberating the prisoners in Kilmainham. Rattican showed him a plan of the intended attack upon Kilmainham. Whilst he was in Dublin in April, he dined with Neilson at the Brazen Head.

Hughes had his interview with Lord Edward, while the latter was "on his keeping" in Dublin, about a month before his arrest.

Notwithstanding the importance of the information Hughes possessed and gave before the committee, he never appeared as a witness at the trials of those persons he implicated by his disclosures.

This circumstance, on more than one occasion, surprised me a good deal; but the cause of Mr.

Hughes being kept back at a crisis when evidence like his would have insured the conviction of the Belfast leaders, with few, if indeed with any exceptions, became at once intelligible enough to leave little doubt that he was reserved for higher functions than the Reynoldses and O'Briens, and more important objects were to be effected by him than he could achieve in the witness-box.

This man has carefully suppressed the fact in his evidence, that in the year 1797 he was arrested on a charge of high treason at Newry, and immediately after being brought into Belfast, the same evening, was liberated on bail.[1]

The use which was made of Hughes after Lord Edward's arrest, and at the period too at which he had his head-quarters at the Castle of Dublin, is very clearly shown in the narrative of the confinement and exile of the Rev. William Steele Dickson, Presbyterian minister of Portaferry, in the county Down.

Dr. Dickson was arrested on the 4th of June, 1798, in consequence of the disclosures made by Magin and Hughes.

During his confinement in the house called the Donegal Arms, then the Provost prison of Belfast, the plan was carried into effect, which had been very generally adopted at this frightful period in other parts of the country, of apprehending some of the least suspected informers,

[1] History of Belfast, p. 478.

and having it rumoured abroad that such persons had been arrested as ringleaders of the rebels, who were sure to be convicted, and then placing these persons among the unfortunate prisoners, for the purpose of making the latter furnish evidence against themselves and their companions. This proceeding, which would hardly be had recourse to in any other civilized country, is described by Dr. Dickson, from his own sad experience of it.

With respect to Hughes, the circumstances which require consideration are the following:

In October, 1797, he is arrested and charged with high treason, brought into Belfast, and liberated the same day on bail. He becomes a bankrupt the same year, and in March, 1798, he surrenders himself under the commission in Dublin.

In April, between the 20th and the 29th of that month, he visited Lord Edward with Neilson; about the 28th of the same month, accompanied by Neilson, he also visited Mr. Grattan. On the 19th of May, Lord Edward was arrested. Hughes's services are found employed in the north in the beginning of the next month, worming himself into the confidence of Dr. Steele Dickson, supposed to be the adjutant-general of the county Down; a man, of all others of the Ulster United Irishmen, against whom evidence was most desired. For this pur-

pose, we find Hughes apprehended on the 7th of June at Belfast,[1] and the immediate object of this colourable arrest was, by placing him in confinement with the prisoners recently taken up in Belfast, to obtain evidence of guilt of those who were suspected. Of the arrest, as well as of the former, Mr. Hughes thought it desirable to make no mention in his evidence.

Quarters in the Castle were assigned to Mr. Hughes shortly after Lord Edward's arrest. The secret service money document affords some clue to the period of his residence there.

From June, 1798, to the latter end of March, 1802, we find the head-quarters of Mr. Hughes were at the Castle.

The reward for the discovery of Lord Edward Fitzgerald was offered on the 11th of May; earned on the 19th; and paid on the 20th of the month following, to F. H. The Christian name of Hughes does not correspond with this first initial. The reader has been furnished with sufficient data to enable him to determine whether those initials were intended to designate Hughes or some other individual; whether the similarity of the capital letters J and F, in the handwriting in question, may admit, or not, of one letter being mistaken for another, the F for a J; or whether a correspondent of Major Sirr's, who sometimes signed himself J. H., and whose name was Joel

[1] "History of Belfast."

Hulbert, an informer, residing in 1798 in Monastereven, may have been indicated by them.

In the spring of 1797, the man of unparalleled infamy, Mr. Thomas Reynolds, made an application to the Duke of Leinster for a lease of the lands of Kilkea. Through the interference in his behalf of Lord Edward Fitzgerald with his brother (though this fact is denied in Mr. Reynolds's biography), he was put in possession of Kilkea Castle and about 350 acres of land—"of the first land in the county"—on paying down a fine of £1,000, "the reserved rent amounting to no more than £48 2s. a year!"—terms so advantageous as could only have been obtained by friendly interference with the owner of the property.

The interference of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, with regard to the lease of Kilkea Castle, in favour of Reynolds, is called, with the usual modesty of his biographer, "a piece of pure invention from beginning to end." "Early in 1797 (this gentleman states), his father took from the Duke of Leinster the valuable lease of the castle and lands of Kilkea;" that "he became a United Irishman in February, 1797;" that, "in November, 1797, Lord Edward called on his father, and asked him to take his place as colonel of a regiment of United Irishmen, enrolled in the county of Kildare, for a short time." These dates are rather unfortunate for the ardu-

ous task of whitewashing the character of Mr. Reynolds's friendship, considering the very advantageous terms on which the lease was granted to him, and the confidential communications between Lord Edward and Mr. Reynolds, admitted by the latter, in November, 1797, the very month of his obtaining the lease from the Duke of Leinster.

In the second volume of his work, Mr. Reynolds's biographer states, that Kilkea Castle, of which he had a lease for three lives renewable for ever—estimating the 360 acres of land at twenty-six shillings per acre, at only twenty years' purchase, was worth £8,100.

In the information given upon oath by Thomas Reynolds, and afterwards confirmed before the Secret Committee in 1799, his intimacy with Lord Edward is thus alluded to: "Deponent further saith, that in November, 1797, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, accompanied by Hugh Wilson, met deponent upon the steps of the Four Courts, and told him that he wished to speak to him upon very particular business; that deponent informed Lord Edward Fitzgerald he would be found in Park Street, if he called on him there; that deponent and Lord Edward knew each other only personally, and that only from a purchase deponent had been about in the county of Kildare from the Duke of Leinster." [1]

[1] "Report of Secret Committee, 1798."

Here Reynolds himself acknowledges what is positively denied by his son, that in the business relating to the purchase from the Duke of Leinster, Mr. Reynolds had a personal knowledge of Lord Edward Fitzgerald.

It would appear from young Mr. Reynolds's work, that his father had a sincere regard for Lord Edward Fitzgerald. It is very probable that he had as much regard for his lordship as it was in his nature to feel for any man—that is to say, he had no personal animosity to this young nobleman; and after the arrests at Bond's, perhaps, had nothing to gain (when he knew the secret of the place of concealment) by betraying him; for the reward of £1,000 for his apprehension was not published till the 11th of May, and Reynolds was not then in town. But when it was part of the duty required of him by his employers, to deprive the widow and children of his dead friend of the means of subsistence, he was restrained by no compunctious visitings of nature from swearing away the property of his friend, as he had done the lives of his associates.

There are three proofs given by Mr. Reynolds, junior, of the friendship of his father for Lord Edward. Two days after the arrest at Bond's on his information—(Lord Edward having so far fortunately escaped that peril by the accidental circumstance of seeing Major Sirr's party enter the house when he, Lord Edward, was on

his way there, at the corner of Bridge Street)—Reynolds visited Lord Edward at his place of concealment, at Dr. Kennedy's in Aungier Street, and discussed with his lordship his future plans as to his concealment, etc. Mr. Reynolds discovered "he had no arms of any sort except a small dagger, and he was quite unprovided with cash, which was then scarce, as the banks had stopped all issue of gold. My father called on him again, on the evening of the 15th, and brought him fifty guineas in gold, and a case of good-sized pistols, with ammunition and a mould for casting bullets.[1] He took the pistols, threw a cloak over his shoulders, and left the house accompanied by Mr. Lawless. My father never saw him more." Poor Lord Edward little imagined from what source that money had been derived, or that he and his companions had been betrayed by the very man who had been so recently in his company, and who had already drawn on the agent of the government for the first portion of that stipulated sum which was the reward of his disclosures, and placed a part of the price of his friend's blood in his hands under the semblance of an act of kindness.

The present of the pistols, with the powder and bullet mould, for the protection of a man whose peril he well knew was the consequence of his own treachery to him and his associates, was

[1] "Life of Thomas Reynolds," vol. ii, p. 219.

worthy of Reynolds: villainy less accomplished would hardly have devised so refined an act of specious perfidy. It was a particular feature of Reynolds's infamy, that he seems to have felt a gratification in witnessing the effects of his perfidious proceedings on the unfortunate families of his victims. A few days after the arrests at Bond's, he paid a visit of condolence to Mrs. Bond, and even caressed the child she was holding in her arms. He paid a similar visit of simulated friendship to the wife of Lord Edward Fitzgerald on the 16th of March. Mr. Reynolds's son must tell the particulars of this interview: "She (Lady Fitzgerald) also complained of a want of gold. My father told her he had given Lord Edward fifty guineas the preceding night, and would send her fifty more in the course of that day, which promise he performed. Neither of these sums were ever repaid. In the course of their conversation, my father mentioned his intention of leaving Ireland for a time; on which she took a ring from her finger and gave it to him, saying she hoped to hear from him if he should have anything of importance to communicate, and that she would not attend to any letter purporting to come from him, unless it were sealed with that ring, which was a small red cornelian, engraved with the figure of a dancing satyr."[1]

[1] "Life of Reynolds by his Son."

Mr. Reynolds having deprived himself of his pistols on the 15th of March, the act was considered by him, and at a later period, it would seem, was recognized by government, as one done for *the public service;* for these pistols were replaced by Major Sirr, and the bill for the case purchased on this occasion by the major for his friend was duly presented to Mr. Cooke, and the subsequent payment of it was not forgotten.

"1798, July 26, Major Sirr for
pistols for Mr. Reynolds, . . £9 2 0."

So much for the friendship's offerings of Mr. Thomas Reynolds.

On the trial of Bond, Reynolds deposed he had been sworn a United Irishman in 1797 by Bond. About the 22nd of February, 1798, he returned from a visit at Sir Duke Gifford's, where he met Mr. Cope, Lord Wycombe, Mr. Fitzgerald, and Mr. Madox, where the conversation ran upon Irish politics and the United Irish business. From the date above mentioned, the lives of the principal leaders of the Society of United Irishmen were in the hands of the government.

On the 12th of March, 1798, the arrests took place at Bond's, on the secret information of Thomas Reynolds. Four days later, on the 18th of March, Reynolds attended a meeting of the United Irishmen at the house of one Reilly, a

publican, on the Curragh, at which he produced a letter he had obtained from Lord Edward, recommending the vacancies occasioned by the late arrests to be filled up; but a discussion of a very different kind was immediately introduced, on a proposition "to change all the officers of the county meetings' committees," as it was supposed that none others could have furnished this intelligence on which the government had acted. Reynolds seconded this proposition, he being at the time one of the officers proposed to be changed.

These arrests at Bond's were immediately followed up by those of Thomas Addis Emmet and Dr. William James M'Neven, and on the 19th of May following, of Lord Edward Fitzgerald. Mr. Reynolds, however, had not the merit of having brought his noble friend and benefactor to the scaffold: it was reserved for him, after the death of that friend, in his evidence before parliament, to lay the foundation for an attainder, which was "to visit the cradle of his unprotected offspring with want and misery."

And now, at the conclusion of my researches on this subject of the betrayal of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, I have to confess they have not been successful. The betrayer still preserves his incognito: his infamy, up to the present time (January, 1858), remains to be connected with his name, and, once discovered, to make it odious for evermore. My efforts, however, have not been altogether in vain. I have put future in-

quiry on the right track. The publication by me of the secret service money account, duly authenticated by the government official, Mr. Edward Cooke, has thrown some faint light on this dark, mysterious subject. "F. L., for the Discovery of L. E. F., £1,000," is the first gleam on it that has been shed. Most assuredly it will not be the last. Nine-and-fifty years the secret of the sly, skulking villain has been kept by his employers with no common care for his character or his memory. But, dead or alive, his infamy will be reached in the long run, and the gibbeting of that name of his will be accomplished in due time.

To those who may be disposed to follow up these efforts of mine to bring the villain's memory to justice, I would suggest, let them not seek for the betrayer of Lord Edward Fitzgerald in the lower or middle classes of the Society of United Irishmen; and perhaps if they are to find the traitor a member of any of the learned professions, it is not the medical one that has been disgraced by his connection with it.[1]

[1] Francis Magan, the betrayer of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, was the son of a woollen draper of Dublin, a graduate of Trinity College and a barrister-at-law. He was one of the leading members of the United Irishmen in Dublin. Being in financial difficulties, he was induced by Francis Higgins, the notorious "Sham Squire," proprietor of the "Freeman's Journal," to betray through him, the secrets of the organization. He supplied the authorities through Higgins, with the information which led to the capture of the leader of the conspiracy, Lord Edward Fitzgerald. Magan, whose treachery was never suspected during his lifetime, died in Dublin in 1833.—Ed.

CHAPTER IX

DEATH OF LORD EDWARD

LORD EDWARD FITZGERALD was captured, and wounded severely in the right arm, near the shoulder, on the evening of the 19th of May, 1798. That pistol-ball wound was the result of the deliberate aim taken by Major Sirr from his secure position on the landing at the top of the stairs in Murphy's house, at his victim, already engaged in a deadly struggle with the two subordinate rebel-hunters, whom Sirr had prudently sent before him to make the perilous capture of a man of known valour—Major Swan, Mr. Ryan (in yeomanry parlance Captain Ryan). At the call of the major, the soldiers had then rushed up the stairs, overpowered Lord Edward, and secured their prey. But the struggles of the wounded man, weltering in his blood, were still so formidable in the opinion of the gallant major, that he was not satisfied with seeing the fire-locks of the soldiers flung down across the body of the prostrate captive; he had the wounded prisoner bound, and while that operation of cross-musketing and binding of the disabled Geraldine was

going on, he witnessed and permitted a superfluous exhibition of dastardly immanity or overvalorous loyalty, as he might deem it, on the part of a drummer, by the infliction of another wound on the back of the neck of the beaten down, bleeding prisoner, which was only "slight," being "not so deep as a well, nor so wide as a church door," but it sufficed, we are told, to contribute to the sufferings of poor Lord Edward in his last moments, or, as medical men might perhaps more justly think (from the position of that wound), to the production of those tetanic symptoms, which ushered in his death. Lord Edward, moreover, had been bruised and cut in three places on his left hand. A surgeon of great eminence, Mr. Adrien, being in the neighbourhood (at the house of Mr. Laurence Tighe, a chandler in Thomas Street, living within three or four doors of Murphy's house, though the fact is not stated, I believe, in any published reports), was sent for by the major, to examine the wounds of Ryan, Swan, and Lord Edward.

The question naturally arises, how did Major Sirr know that Surgeon Adrien was at the house of Laurence Tighe? For what special services was this Laurence Tighe, a Roman Catholic of no political influence, shortly afterwards rewarded with a lucrative official situation, which was sufficiently advantageous to induce him to abandon his business? When did the acquaint-

ance with Major Sirr commence, which privileged him to correspond with that officer, and to seek his good offices with a view to the disposal of his premises to the government for barracks? (See the major's papers, Library of Trinity College, Dublin.)

Lord Camden sent his private secretary, Mr. Watson, to Lord Edward, after he had been taken from Murphy's to the office of the secretary of war, to assure the latter that orders had been given that every possible attention that was compatible with the security of his person would be shown to him, and to acquaint him likewise that the secretary was commissioned to acquaint Lady Edward, with all due care and consideration, with the intelligence of the painful occurrences of that evening. That secretary discharged his duties in a way that might be expected from an English gentleman, not long enough in an Irish office closely connected with government to have his feelings perverted and turned from their natural direction towards tenderness and kindliness, to active sympathies with the sordid interests and the vile party purposes of the faction dominant in Ireland. He bent over Lord Edward, who was leaning back on two chairs with his arm extended, supported by the surgeon-general, Stewart,[1] then in the act of

[1] Mr. Stewart, the surgeon-general, was a man of great worth and goodness of heart. I am able to state, on the authority of

dressing his wound, and took an opportunity of whispering in Lord Edward's ear (unheard by those in the chamber) his readiness to execute any wish of his faithfully and secretly, or communicate any confidential message of his to Lady Edward. The answer given to that kind offer was spoken calmly—"No, no, thank you; nothing, nothing; only break it to her tenderly."

Lady Edward, while the deadly struggle in Murphy's house was going on on the evening of the 19th, was at a party at Lord Moira's on Usher's Island; but Mr. Watson, who had proceeded there after he left Lord Edward, was not suffered by Lady Moira to communicate the intelligence to Lady Edward; and it was only the following day she was made acquainted with it. She was then in delicate health, and only a few weeks had elapsed since her premature confinement had taken place in Denzille Street,[1] the

one of the ablest surgeons of his time, and to state publicly now for the first time, that Surgeon Lawless, subsequently General Lawless, owed his life to the timely information of his intended arrest, sent to him by the surgeon-general the day before the arrest of the two Sheares, through the late eminent Surgeon Peile. That timely intelligence enabled him to effect his escape to the continent. Similar intelligence, at the same period, was sent to another medical gentleman of the highest standing in his profession, then lecturing in the College of Surgeons—Surgeon Dean —by Stewart, and through the same medium of communication. Dean, unfortunately, made no attempt to escape. He went home from the college where the intelligence was given to him, opened the femoral artery, and died of hemorrhage.—R. R. M.

[1] Lucy Louisa, the second daughter of Lord Edward, was born in April, 1798.

result of surprise and anxiety, occasioned by the unexpected visit of her husband at her then place of residence in that street.

It was Lord Camden's wish, it is stated in Moore's work, that Lord Edward should not be removed from the Castle, but should be allowed to remain there in safe custody. But the civic authorities, as represented by Sirr, would not consent to give up their prisoner, by whom two of their officers had been wounded; and the civil authorities, represented by Castlereagh and Clare, concurring with the former, poor Lord Camden, of course, submitted to the will of his masters, having no will of his own; so Lord Edward was conveyed to Newgate, and placed in a cell which had been occupied by Lord Aldborough. From the commencement of his imprisonment to within a few hours of his death, all access to him, except on two occasions, on the part of his relatives and friends, was savagely denied and peremptorily refused by Earl Camden. Not even the old confidential servant of the Leinster family, Shiel, nor the trusty negro servant of Lord Edward, "the faithful Tony," whose honest black face was the only thing Lord Edward loved to look on, as he says in one of his letters from Canada, were allowed to attend on him throughout his sufferings.

His favourite brother, Henry, worried the

Lord Lieutenant and Lord Chancellor[1] and the Chief Secretary with entreaties to be permitted to see his dying brother. But it was only when in the agonies of death, and within a few hours of his end, that Lords Camden and Castlereagh could be got to relax in the harshness of their barbarous rigour.

Lady Louisa Connolly and Lord Henry Fitzgerald were permitted to visit their dying relative on Sunday evening, 3rd of June, 1798; and the following Monday morning, at two o'clock, on the 4th instant, the corpse of the gallant, pure-minded, brave-hearted Lord Edward Fitzgerald lay stiff and cold in a cell of Newgate. And there members of Beresford's corps of yeomanry (two of whom, while the breath was in that body, had been seen with drawn swords standing by the bedside of the suffering prisoner) tramped up and down, and chatted with jail officials, and felt that kind of satisfaction which men of brutal instincts feel in being rid of the presence of a superior intelligence and a noble nature, and thus escaping from the consciousness of their own depravity and perversity being observed and comprehended, and rebuked by such observation. They felt, moreover, a sense of security, which

[1] To the first application of Lord Henry Fitzgerald, begging to be permitted to see his brother, Lord Clare replied, that he was sorry that it was impossible to comply with his wishes, and he adds—"If I could explain to you the grounds of this restriction, even you would hardly be induced to condemn it as unnecessarily harsh."

they could not say they possessed while there was one spark of life in their prisoner's breast or the slightest movement in his limbs, when they glanced at the still, pallid features of that corpse of the brave, high-spirited man, who lay dead before them.

Ryan survived his wounds twelve days; Lord Edward survived his, fifteen days. On the 26th, the latter made his will; but even in the execution of that instrument, no person in any way connected with his lordship's family was suffered to go near him. Even Mr. Leeson, a professional gentleman, who was brought to Newgate to see that will executed, and to advise the dying man as to the manner of carrying his last wishes into effect, was not suffered to enter the prison; he remained seated in a carriage at the door, while the surgeon-general went backwards and forwards from the cell of the prisoner to the carriage outside the jail, communicating between Lord Edward and his legal adviser on matters of such importance to the interests of the wife and children of the testator. That instrument, by which he left all he died possessed of to his wife, Lady Fitzgerald, during her life, and at her death to descend, share and share alike, to his children, "she maintaining and educating those children according to her discretion," was signed by two of his medical attendants, Alexander Lindsay, a surgeon, and George Stewart, surgeon-general,

and also by Samuel Stone, a lieutenant of the Derry militia.

At the commencement of Lord Edward's imprisonment in Newgate, Lieutenant Stone had been appointed by the authorities to remain with Lord Edward, and see that he was duly attended to. This gentleman executed the duties assigned to him with humanity and kindness; and Lord Edward's sufferings were in some degree soothed by the affectionate interest which he seemed to feel in him; and Lord Edward, we are told, was pleased with him: but, without any assignable cause or motive that could be imagined, except that by his humanity he had rendered himself pleasing to the dying prisoner, he was removed from his charge upon the 2nd of June; but at the request of Lady Louisa Connolly, he was permitted to accompany the remains of Lord Edward to their final resting place in Werburgh's church, on Wednesday, the 6th of June, accompanied by an old, faithful servant of the Leinster family, of the name of Shiel.

One of the state prisoners then confined in Newgate, an eminent solicitor of Dublin, who had been an agent of Mr. Grattan, Matthew Dowling, found means to write and despatch a letter to Lord Henry Fitzgerald, on Sunday, the 3rd of June, wherein he states: "Your brother, Lord Edward, is dangerously ill, in fact, dying—he was delirious some time last night";

and he adds—"Surely, my lord, some attention ought to be paid to him." And then follow these words, written some time later on the same day—"He is now better, and has called for a chicken for dinner." And then, in a still later postscript, written after two o'clock (in the afternoon), the writer, a humane and good man, who had known Lord Edward as well as Lord Henry Fitzgerald "in happier days," observes—"Seeing you or any friend he has confidence in, would, I think, be more conducive to his recovery than fifty surgeons. I saw him a few moments last night, but he did not know me. We will watch him as well as is in our power."

The letter of Dowling to Lord Henry Fitzgerald, written on Sunday, the 3rd of June, could leave no doubt of Lord Edward's being in the last extremity. Another member of the Leinster family, Lady Louisa Connolly, who was kept daily informed of his state of health, received an express from Dublin, communicating such alarming intelligence as induced her immediately to come to town, and make one more effort to obtain permission to see her dying relative. She succeeded that time, and the clemency of Camden and Castlereagh was extended even to the favourite brother of Lord Edward. But that clemency was extended when the prisner was within a few hours of his death, when he had been two days in paroxysms of occasional

delirium, and had been frequently attacked with spasms—the sure forerunner of approaching death in a case like that of Lord Edward.

The particulars of this closing scene may be given in a few words. Between eleven and twelve o'clock on Sunday night, the 3rd of June, 1798, Lady Louisa Connolly and Lord Henry Fitzgerald were ushered into the cell where Lord Edward lay, evidently dying. On the preceding Friday night he had undergone a great change for the worse: those about him considered his life was in imminent danger. He was delirious at repeated intervals throughout that night, the day following, and Saturday night. Several of the state prisoners heard him speaking very loudly, sometimes even shouting, at these periods; and on Saturday night one of the leaders of the Society of United Irishmen, more fortunate than most of his associates in being at large (who probably had means of receiving written communication from some prisoner of his acquaintance, whose cell, like that of Lord Edward, was in the front part of the prison, with its windows facing Green Street), as he passed at the opposite side of the street, and repassed at intervals, could distinctly hear the voice of Lord Edward loudly exerted. The occasional shouts heard were like those of a delirious person, and they proceeded from a front cell, the grated window of which was known to be that of the room in

which Lord Edward was confined. Nicholas Murphy, in whose house Lord Edward was captured, and who was then a prisoner in Newgate, states in his narrative, that, during the night before his death, he heard Lord Edward frequently crying out, as if he was leading on a body of armed men reluctant to advance: "Come on!—D——n you! come on!"

It would appear, from Moore's "Life and Death of Lord Edward Fitzgerald," that Lady Louisa Connolly had but one interview with Lord Edward in Newgate. Lady Louisa Connolly, in relating that interview, makes no allusion to any former one of hers with Lord Edward during his confinement. Mr. Moore makes no allusion to it; yet he was not ignorant of its occurrence; but the fact is, that interview did take place, after Lady Louisa Connolly, the high-minded, proud woman, of a noble character, had humbled herself to the dust, had knelt down to that miserable creature and most contemptible of men, the most unworthy representative of the English sovereign in Ireland who ever disgraced that office—Earl Camden—and had in vain besought him for permission to visit her beloved relative. It was after that base refusal of her prayer that she had recourse, and not in vain, to Lord Clare, and moved that man to a sudden and impulsive act of generosity, obdurate as he was, on all occasions when his passions were

roused, but who had still some feelings of the heart which could be touched, when a sense of personal slight or wrong, or motive for vindictiveness, were not concerned in the matter on which he was appealed to.

But Moore had a theory to support, and an acquaintance with a live lord to link to it; and the advantages of that acquaintance, in this instance, I think, blinded his judgment, and seemed to make it more incumbent on him to defend Lord Camden at the expense of Clare, than to record an act of the latter which redounded to his honour, and contrasted most unfavourably with the stupid and pig-headed obstinacy of the imbecile Camden.

The particulars of that first interview of Lady Louisa Connolly will be found graphically detailed in a letter which the son of Lady Sarah Napier, the illustrious historian of the Peninsular War, Major-General William Napier, was good enough to address to me some years ago. In two other letters of General Napier will be found some references, likewise bearing on this subject.

FROM MAJOR-GENERAL NAPIER TO R. R. MADDEN.

Guernsey, July 31st, 184?.

Sir,—I have just read, with great interest, your work upon the "United Irishmen," and I hasten to correct an error into which you have naturally enough fallen.

The Captain Armstrong mentioned in my mother's journal, which you have quoted from Moore's "Life of Lord Edward Fitzgerald," was a totally different person from the betrayer of the Sheares.

He was a captain of the Londonderry regiment of the line, and, having served under my father, visited our house as a friend. He was in no way connected with the other, and is now, if alive, a general officer. He will be ill pleased at the mistake.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM NAPIER,
Major-General.

R. R. Madden, Esq.

FROM THE SAME TO THE SAME.

Guernsey, August 14th, 1842.

Sir,—I am glad that you feel pleased with the correction of an error into which it was very natural for you to have fallen; but I do not think you need reproach yourself for any injustice towards the S——— A———, the blackness of whose infamy is of too deep a darkness to show any additional stain. I have also a vague notion that he did at a later period call upon my aunt, Lady Louisa Connolly, either with a view to deceive her or to obtain some favour, and that she treated him with that freezing dignity which her innate abhorrence of vice enabled her to assume with more effect than can well be believed by those who never saw her.

I am indeed sure that something of the kind happened, but when, I cannot recollect. . . . The "Dublin Evening Packet" has just been put into my

hands, and I find an article full of foul abuse of your work. This you, of course, must expect. The writer accuses you of exaggeration; but, as far as my knowledge extends, and it is not a confined knowledge of the part you have treated, you might be more reasonably accused of softening the horrid features of cruelty displayed by the government party; and I do not wonder that the organs of that party should now wince and tremble at the just retribution of history. The bad deeds of those unhappy times should be held up to the execration of mankind, as a warning to deter men from repeating them; and the way in which you are doing so is honourable to you, and will be, I hope, useful to the world.

I see you have quoted from a review written by me, upon Sir John Moore's life. The facts I have related there are all taken from that great and good man's papers, and are strictly correct.

It is difficult for me to add to your information, but it would be well to notice one matter in reference to Lord Edward Fitzgerald.

Credit is given to Lord Camden for feelings of kindness and commiseration towards Lady Louisa Connolly, when she applied to him in vain for leave to see her dying nephew, Lord Edward; and Lord Clare is accused of harsh and stern indifference to her prayers. Now it was just the reverse. Lord Camden displayed the most callous indifference to her misery, and Lord Clare showed great feeling and warmth and delicacy of character.

I have no liking for either, and as a politician I abhor Lord Clare the most, because of his actions and

energy in evil; whereas Lord Camden was a mere fool, with the fibres of feeling as insensible as the fibres of intellect to external objects; but truth is truth, and Lord Clare behaved like a man of feeling and generosity on that occasion.

Lady Louisa Connolly, having her niece, Miss Emily Napier, with her, went to Lord Camden, and prayed him long and earnestly, in vain, to let her visit Lord Edward Fitzgerald in his prison. When she came back to her carriage she said, with a violence of feeling the more remarkable from its contrast with the sedate and tranquil dignity which belonged to her character:—"I, who never before kneeled to aught but my God, grovelled at that man's feet in vain."

From the Castle she drove to Lord Clare's house. He was at dinner. It was a sort of cabinet dinner; but he came out instantly to her carriage, having his napkin in his hand. She asked him for an order to see Lord Edward. He said "he could not give her one, it had been so settled." But seeing the strong emotion excited by the answer, he added, abruptly, "but I can go with you, and let you into the jail." Then jumping into the carriage, having his napkin still in his hand, he drove to the jail, introduced her, and after some time came out to Miss Napier, and said, "Lady Louisa will be here a long time; it is not fitting you should remain here. I will remain with her." And then placing a police-officer behind the carriage to protect it, he sent Miss Napier home, returned to the outer room of Lord Edward's prison, and remained for three or four hours, waiting Lady Louisa's time of departure.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

W. NAPIER.

R. R. Madden, Esq.

There is a remarkable confirmation of the fact referred to by Major-General Napier, of Lady Louisa Connolly's visit to Lord Edward, accompanied by Lord Clare, previously to her visit along with Lord Henry Fitzgerald on the 3rd of June, which alone is recorded by Moore, in one of the debates in the House of Peers on the subject of the attainder, in which Lord Clare, speaking in a becoming manner of the circumstances connected with Lord Edward's death, said, "he well remembered them, for, a short time before the death took place, he was witness to one of the most painful and melancholy scenes he had ever experienced."

This, I think, is conclusive as to the visit of Lady Louisa Connolly accompanied by Lord Clare; and if anything more were needed to be said on the subject, the reader might be referred to the recent memoirs of the Whig party, and of his own times, of Lord Holland, where, speaking in terms of commendation of Lord Edward's amiable and generous disposition, he notices the remarkable proof given by him of forgetfulness of great injuries shortly before his death, when his old adversary and former enemy visited him in Newgate, and on taking his departure would

have shaken hands with him, but poor Lord Edward, smiling, and pointing at the same time to his maimed hands and disabled arm, said, "As I cannot shake hands with you, I must only shake a toe."

I return to Lady Louisa Connolly's and Lord Henry Fitzgerald's interviews with Lord Edward on the Sunday night preceding his death. Lord Edward's mind, Lady Louisa says, had been agitated two days previously to that interview on the Sunday night, but he was then calm, and the agitation was sufficiently gone to enable him to bear this interview with composure. Lady Louisa first approached the bed. The poor sufferer looked at her, knew her, kissed her, and said: "It is Heaven to me to see you;" and then, as if his mind began to wander again a little, turning to the other side of the bed, he said: "I can't see you." Lady Louisa went round; he took hold of her hand, and he kissed it, and, fixing on her well-known face those dimmed eyes of his, in which the look of death was obvious enough, he smiled at her. Lady Louisa said what she thought, of all things in this world, would be most pleasing,—that "Henry was come;" and poor Lord Edward, brightening up momentarily, but yet manifesting no surprise at hearing of his arrival in Ireland, said: "Where is he, dear fellow?" Lord Henry stepped forward to the bedside, and "the two dear brothers frequently

embraced each other, and the scene was one which might have melted the hardest heart in the world"—perhaps even that of Lord Camden.

The jail officials were touched at the sad spectacle; a sort of instinctive delicacy of feeling seemed to operate on them, for every one of them left the room, and then Lady Louisa told Lord Edward that she and his brother Henry were alone with him, and the reply of the latter was, "That is very pleasant." Camden could have conferred that pleasure on the wounded prisoner when it might have tended towards his restoration. After thus briefly expressing the pleasure he experienced in being alone even for a few moments with those he so tenderly loved, Lady Louisa mentioned the name of Lady Edward, and said she had embarked for England; and the reference to his dear wife seemed again to push back for an instant the mist that was gathering over his memory, and that momentary brightening of the mind at the close of life was exhibited in his case in the inquiry, "And the children too?" That subject was next to his heart; and after those words, the latest in a coherent form from his lips, the angel of death and the dark shadow of his wings seemed to be fast gathering over poor Lord Edward's mind; but his wandering thoughts were still towards home and hearthward. He uttered some words in a raving manner that appeared to have reference

to his wife, "She is a charming woman;" and then he became silent again. But though the power of collecting his thoughts and of connecting them on any subject continuously, or of giving expression to them even in their incoherence, was rapidly growing weaker and weaker, it still appeared by his looks (pale and wan as they were, and greatly altered by his sufferings), that he derived pleasure from the sight of his relatives, and on his "dear Henry," in particular, he looked continually with an expression of pleasure. After remaining with him rather less than an hour, Lady Louisa said to him, as he was inclined to sleep, they would leave him then, and return in the morning. "Do, do," was the only reply he made. But he spoke rambling words from time to time, while they yet lingered at his bedside. He said at one time, "I knew it must come to this"—"We must all go." And he in his ravings sometimes talked fast, and even loud for a dying man, about the militia, and about numbers of men, as if he was thinking of them arrayed for battle; and when Lady Louisa tried to soothe and calm him, and said to him, "It agitates you to talk upon these subjects," that voice of kindness found its way to his loving heart, and he answered: "Well, I won't." Lady Louisa and Lord Henry at length tore themselves away from his bedside; the last "good night" was wished by them to poor Lord Ed-

ward, but apparently not heard by him. At half-past eleven on that Sunday night they took their departure, and looked on that dear relative no more. Mr. Garnett, a surgeon, who attended him, as Lady Louisa states, for the two days succeeding the removal of Lieutenant Stone, the officer who had been in constant attendance on him, early the next morning, Monday, the 4th of June, communicated to her the intelligence of Lord Edward's death. The struggle, he stated, commenced soon after his friends left the night previously, and his last breath was drawn at half-past two that morning. "Within two hours and a half of the close of a life they prized so dearly," Lady Louisa Connolly and Lord Henry Fitzgerald were at the bedside of Lord Edward.

It is customary to believe, or to affect to believe, that all persons who rebel against any rule, whether good or bad, and are unsuccessful rebels, are Deists, perhaps Atheists—impious men, at all events, who are either unbelievers in Christianity, or utterly indifferent to its interests, or heedless in all respects of its obligations. This is an erroneous opinion or a wilful calumny, as the case may be. Lord Edward Fitzgerald was a Christian man, strongly imbued with the principles and sentiments of a sincere and ardent believer in the Christian religion. He was a tolerant man, but he was true to his own faith—

a simple-minded, single-hearted, worthy member of the Church of England.

On Saturday evening, the last but one of his brief career, when he had become composed for a short time, and more collected than he had been during the day, he called to Mr. Garnett, the surgeon, to bring the Bible, and pointing out himself the part he wished to have read, he begged Mr. Garnett to read there of the death of Christ to him. Mr. Garnett immediately read aloud the history of our Lord's sufferings and death, "and Lord Edward seemed much composed by it."

In the way of medical attendance, during the whole term of Lord Edward's imprisonment, there was no ground for complaint against the government. Three surgeons were employed by government. Two of them were men of eminence in their profession—the Surgeon-general, Stewart, and Surgeon Lindsay; a third, Mr. Garnett, of less note as a practitioner, but all men of honour and high character.

On the day previous to the interment, an inquest was held on the remains, which necessitated the opening of the body and the examination of the wound in the shoulder; and it was ascertained, or rather the finding of the jury was to the effect, that Lord Edward Fitzgerald had died from the effects of fever, aggravated by very great anxiety.

The finding of the coroner's inquest was to the following effect:

> We are of opinion that deceased came by his death by an effusion of water on the left side of the thorax, and inflammation of the lungs of that side, as appeared to us upon the testimony of four eminent surgeons, by fever, brought on by great anxiety of mind, aided by two wounds inflicted on the right arm by two pistol balls found lodged near the scapula of the side.

Now, if there be any meaning in this verdict, it is this: the deceased died from fever, caused by great anxiety of mind, aggravated by a wound in the shoulder, which fever was productive of effusion of water on the chest. The principal cause, then, of Lord Edward's death is ascribed by the verdict to great anxiety of mind; the secondary cause was the wound in the shoulder; the effect of both was fever and effusion on the chest. The logical inference of this verdict is, that if the great anxiety of the mind of Lord Edward had been soothed, the fever and the fatal result might not have occurred. And if the preceding pages clearly show that Lord Camden obstinately and obdurately refused all solicitations to afford the deceased the solace and assistance of his friends, nay, the very gratification of seeing them till he was actually dying, we must come to the conclusion that the only probable means of soothing the great anxiety of the

suffering prisoner was debarred him by the orders of Lord Camden, and that the death of that prisoner lies at the door of that noble lord. But I am not disposed to push the argument to that extreme extent, though such was the view taken by Lord Henry Fitzgerald, as we find by the following passage of his letter to Lord Camden, immediately after Lord Edward's death:—

Nor, my lord, shall I scruple to declare to the world —I wish I could to the four quarters of it!—that, amongst you, your ill-treatment has murdered my brother, as much as if you had put a pistol to his head. In this situation no charitable message arrives to his relations; no offer to allow attached servants to attend upon him, who could have been depended upon in keeping dreadful news of all sorts from him. No, no; to his grave, in madness, you would pursue him; to his grave you persecuted him. . . . On Saturday, my poor, forsaken brother, who had but that night and the next day to live, was disturbed; he heard the noise of the execution of Clinch at the prison door.[1] He

[1] On Saturday, the 2nd of June, 1798, Mr. John Clinch, a young gentleman of respectable family, an officer in Captain Ormsby's Rathcool yeomanry corps, was executed in front of Newgate prison, pursuant to a sentence of a court-martial, having been tried the day before, and condemned on the evidence of a mere boy. I have recently (1857) visited the cell, or rather room, in Newgate, in which Lord Edward died; and if I had not visited it some forty years ago, I would have been in danger of having a wrong room passed off on me for the one I was in search of; I found, however, one of the jail officials acquainted with the place I sought. I was conducted to it by him; and on entering the room, I recognized the locality I had first visited

asked eagerly, "What noise is that?" And certainly, in some manner or other he knew it; for—O God! what am I to write?—from that time he lost his senses: most part of the night he was raving mad; a keeper from a madhouse was necessary." . . .

All the waters in the sea will not suffice to wash away the stain which the cruel conduct of Lord Camden in this case has left upon his character. By that conduct he aggravated the sufferings and he shortened the life of Lord Edward Fitzgerald.

The Peachums and Lockets of Pitt's Irish

when I was a boy. I may observe, I was accompanied, on my last visit, by my friend John Lentaigne, Esq., one of the Directors of Convict Prisons for Ireland. The cell, previously to Lord Edward's time called Lord Aldborough's room, and since June, 1798, best known as Lord Edward's room, is on the right-hand side of the prison as you enter from Green Street. There are two windows in this room looking into Green Street, on the second stage; the sill of the windows is just twenty feet from the flagway of the street on the outside. The gallows, under which the visitor to Newgate passes, is immediately over the principal entrance, and on the right-hand side, the next window to it, of the cell on the second stage, is one of the windows of Lord Edward's room; and it is important to bear in mind, when an execution took place, the suspended man was within sixteen or eighteen feet of the window nearest the gallows of Lord Edward's cell. There is a third window in this room looking backwards into the yards of the prison. There is a fire-place in the room and formerly (in 1798) the access to it was by a short flight of steps from one of the yards at the rear. These have been done away with, and the entrance is now by a passage from the vestibule of the prison. The length of this room is 15½ feet; the breadth is 13 feet; the height is 9½ feet. For a prison, a room of these dimensions must be accounted commodious, if not comfortable.—R. R. M.

administration, after the Reign of Terror had come to a close, wrangled and jangled in private, and left no effort untried to blacken one another's characters, with the view of exculpating themselves. Thus we find Camden's friends acting in regard to Lords Clare and Castlereagh; Clare's friend James Roche, the octogenarian essayist, in regard to the former; and the noble Marquis of Londonderry, in his biography of his brother, in regard to Lord Castlereagh and some others of his Irish colleagues.

"On talking," says Moore, "to Watson Taylor about Lord Edward Fitzgerald, he took occasion to assure me that Lord Camden was, in Ireland, constantly outvoted in his wish for a more moderate system of government by Clare and Castlereagh."[1]

Mr. Watson Taylor was the private secretary of Lord Camden in Ireland in 1797 and 1798.

[1] "Moore's Life," by Lord John Russell.

CHAPTER X

ATTAINDER OF LORD EDWARD

A BILL of attainder of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Cornelius Grogan, and Beauchamp Bagenal Harvey, was introduced into the House of Commons the 27th of July, 1798, by Mr. Toler, then attorney-general, a man in every way worthy of the part assigned him by the Irish government in that iniquitous proceeding. Lord Edward Fitzgerald, though alleged to have committed various acts of high treason since the 1st of November, 1797, had not been tried for any crime, was unconvicted and uncondemned. Grogan, a poor old gouty gentleman, whose only crime was liberality of sentiment and an income of six thousand a-year, was most wickedly murdered according to law by the terrorists of his county, to whom he was obnoxious because he was not an Orangeman.

The bill of attainder was carried triumphantly through both Houses of Parliament. The farce was performed, and the formality gone through of examining credible witnesses, and among the latter, the friend of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Mr. Thomas Reynolds, was duly examined, and on his evidence chiefly the widow and children of Lord Edward were deprived of the little prop-

erty left by him, which at any period never exceeded six hundred a year. But, however small the amount, it was their sole dependence, and it was taken from them. The bill received the royal assent in the month of October, 1798. Lord Clare, however, to his honour, eventually allowed the estate to be sold in chancery, with the sanction of the attorney-general, to Mr. Ogilvie, for the sum of £10,500, and subsequently it was settled by Mr. Ogilvie on Lord Edward's son and his heirs for ever. From the date of the attainder to the year 1819; various applications were made by members of Lord Edward's family for the reversal of that measure. To the various memorials and letters praying for the reversal of the attainder, addressed to the King, the Prince Regent, and the Duke of York, we find the names attached of the Duke of Richmond, Lord Holland, Charles James Fox, General Fox, Lord Henry Fitzgerald, Mr. Ogilvie, the Duchess of Leinster, and Lady Louisa Connolly.

For the period of twenty-one years these efforts were persevered in, and notwithstanding the Prince Regent and the Duke of York had generously expressed their desire on several occasions that the attainder should be reversed—notwithstanding the powerful influence exerted by the Duke of Richmond in favour of that object, such was the power of the Orange ascend-

ency faction in the Irish government, that all those efforts proved of no avail for the lengthened period above referred to.

It remained for the Earl of Liverpool, in 1819, to perform a great act of tardy justice, and to gain for the Prince Regent the highest eulogy that a prince could receive, on a reversal of that attainder. The conduct of the Prince Regent in this instance certainly deserved the noble tribute paid to it by one of the first of English poets.

The remains of the son of the Duke of Leinster, the most honoured and beloved of all his race, whom a mercenary man-hunter, in the Reign of Terror, of the name of Sirr, shot from behind a door, skulking like a wary bully from the dangers he induced his associates to encounter at the peril of their lives, were stealthily conveyed in the dead of night from the jail where he died, with all the privacy and paucity of care and consideration for the dead, that one might expect to encounter at the interment of a malefactor.

At two o'clock in the morning of the 4th of June, 1798, Lord Edward Fitzgerald breathed his last in Newgate.

Two persons escorted the remains to their destination—one of the name of Shiel, a servant of the Leinster family, and a Lieutenant Stone, an English officer, who had been appointed to watch over the wounded prisoner, and had been

removed, there is reason to believe, for exhibiting some evidences of humanity in the discharge of the duty assigned to him. The solitary coach which constituted the funeral cortege on that occasion, was stopped no less than four times by the military yeomanry rabble or armed Orangemen who then guarded, or rather governed, the city of Dublin, and eventually the whole cortege was captured and detained by the gallant captors, till a message was despatched to the Castle, and Mr. Edward Cooke sent back the orders that he neglected to have previously issued, for the interment of the remains of Lord Edward without molestation at the hands of the military. So the valiant terrorists released the dead body of the chief of the United Irishmen, whose name when living inspired them with very uncomfortable feelings.[1]

The conduct of every member of the noble family of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, from the time of his capture to that of the interment of

[1] On the back of a letter of Lady Louisa Connolly, cited by Moore, is the following memorandum, in the hand-writing of Lord Henry:—"From Lady Louisa Connolly—in consequence of a complaint made to her of the indecent neglect in Mr. Cooke's office, by Mr. Leeson. A guard was to have attended at Newgate, the night of my poor brother's burial, in order to provide against all interruption from the different guards and patrols in the streets:—it never arrived, which caused the funeral to be several times stopped in its way, so that the burial did not take place till near two in the morning, and the people attending were obliged to stay in the church until a pass could be procured to enlarge them."

his remains and down to the period of the reversal of the attainder and the restoration of his property to his children, was an exemplification of that ardent attachment and strong affection, which bound all the members of the Fitzgerald family, and in an especial manner two members of it, alike estimable for their virtues and remarkable for their intellectual qualities,—Lady Louisa Connolly and Lady Sarah Napier —to their beloved and illustrious relative, Lord Edward Fitzgerald. Nothing was left undone by those truly noble Englishwomen that could be thought of or attempted in his behalf while living, or for his memory when dead. I have often had occasion to remark, in these mournful records of the lives and struggles of the principal leaders of the United men, that in the hour of their adverse fortune, at the time of the failure of their cause, and the catastrophes which marked the close of the career of so many of them, the only fidelity of affection which seemed to remain unshaken by surrounding circumstances of terror, or desperation, or the tyranny of dominant opinions conformed to the views of a faction in temporary ascendency, was displayed by women, connected by blood or other bonds of affection and friendship with those men who perished in a cause which they believed to be that of their country. And those who may be desirous to find this remark illustrated in a very striking manner,

have only to turn to the letters of Lady Louisa Connolly and Lady Sarah Napier, in Moore's biography, on the subject of the capture, imprisonment, death, and burial of Lord Edward Fitzgerald. It was only necessary for me to cite a single passage in a letter of Lady Connolly in relation to the arrangements made by her for the interment of the remains of Lord Edward, to give some idea of that lady's devoted attachment to Lord Edward. The mournful interest which that passage excites, combines well with the calm dignity of its tone. We may venture thus to interpret the thought that pervades it:— "I will instruct my sorrows to be proud. I ordered everything upon that occasion that appeared to me to be right, considering all the heart-breaking circumstances belonging to that event; and I was guided by the feelings which I am persuaded our beloved angel would have had upon the same occasion, had he been to direct for me, as it fell to my lot to do for him. I well knew that to run the smallest risk of shedding one drop of blood on that mournful occasion, would be the thing of all others that would vex him most; and knowing also how much he despised all outward show, I submitted to what I thought prudence required."

It remained for another noble-minded woman, at a later period, to furnish an example of the same ruling passion of strong love for the be-

loved dead, and lively sense of obligation to the memory of a long departed friend. Nearly forty-five years had elapsed since the death of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, when his daughter, Lady Guy Campbell, had the remains of her father, and the shrouding-sheet in which they lay, placed in another coffin, deeming, in all probability, the time would come when others might think those honoured remains should be removed to a more proper resting place, namely, in the family vault of Kildare, or that in Christ's church, where the remains of Lord Edward's father are deposited.

The preceding notice in the first edition of this work, was not without a result that was desired, and that might naturally be expected at the hands of a lady who has claims in her own excellence to the regard and esteem of all who know her, and one great claim to general respect, as the daughter of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, in her filial love and reverence for her father's memory.

Shortly after I visited the place of interment of Lord Edward's remains, fifteen years ago (which it cost me no small amount of trouble to ascertain with certainty), the following account was given of that visit in the first series of this work, published in 1842.

In one of the vaults of Werburgh's church the remains of Lord Edward Fitzgerald are de-

posited, immediately under the chancel. There are two leaden coffins here, laid side by side; the shorter of the two is that which contains the remains of Lord Edward Fitzgerald. The upper part of the leaden coffin of the latter, in many places, has become decayed and encrusted with a white powder; and in such places the woollen cloth that lines the inner part of the coffin is visible, and still remains in a perfect state.

The entrance to the vault where the remains of Lord Edward Fitzgerald are interred, is within a few paces of the grave of Henry Charles Sirr, by whose hand the former perished. The desperate struggle that took place between them, the one survived fifteen days, the other, forty-three years. Few who visit the place where they are interred, will recall the history of both, without lamenting the fate of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, and deploring the evils of the calamitous times which called the services of such a man as Sirr into action.

The coffin in which Lady Guy Campbell had the remains of her noble father placed, bears the following inscription on a brass plate:—

LORD EDWARD FITZGERALD,
Fifth son of the Duke of Leinster.
Born, October 15, 1763.
Died June 4, 1798.
Buried June 6, 1798.

To preserve the leaden coffin containing his remains,
it was enclosed in this additional protection
by his children,
February 8, 1844.

In a letter from Lady Louisa Connolly to Mr. Ogilvie, dated July 10th, 1798, the following passage occurs:

You must also have heard that the dear remains were deposited by Mr. Bourne in St. Werburgh's Church, until the times would permit of their being removed to the family vault at Kildare.

Years have elapsed since the words above cited were written. The Irish people think the time is come for that act of justice and of duty, when those honoured remains of the noblest man of his race may be removed, without inconvenience to the living or disparagement to the dead, elsewhere from their temporary place of deposit to the family vault at Kildare. There they would fain see a fitting monument to his memory, and, gazing on it, be reminded of all that was noble and generous in his nature.

The character and capabilities of the military chief of the Society of United Irishmen suffer, perhaps, from the abundance of details illustrative of the amiability of his disposition. In their admiration of the latter, people lose sight of the great qualities of the efficient, well-instructed

officer, of the resolute, clear-sighted, energetic, self-possessed man, the practical soldier and commander, with remarkable quickness of perception, capable of glancing over a country, and duly estimating the advantages and disadvantages of each locality of importance as a military position to be defended or assailed. The study of his profession, and the practical knowledge he had gained of it in America, enabled him to form opinions on military subjects, several of which were greatly in advance of those which prevailed in the service three-quarters of a century ago.

No ordinary man, surely, was qualified to play the part of commander-in-chief of masses of undisciplined men in revolt, in the face of such an array of power as confronted the Society of United Irishmen. But Lord Edward was no ordinary man. Though his abilities were not showy, nor his talents brilliant, nor his powers of conversation remarkable, nor his acquaintance with literature extensive, nor his knowledge of science and of philosophy large, nor his familiarity with ancient lore comparable to that of thousands of mere smatterers of our time, he was a brave and a skilful soldier, well versed in his profession, capable of attaining the highest eminence in it,—a right-minded man, always true to himself and others.

Those who have no test but that of success, whereby merit is to be tried and appreciated,

will smile at this estimate of the character and qualities of Lord Edward Fitzgerald.

The maxim *"Les absens ont toujours tort,"* is a twin adage of another morsel of condensed mundane wisdom—an old saw which might be thus rhymed:

> Rebels who fail are never right:
> When they succeed who stoutly fight,
> We call them patriots; and then
> There's hero worship for these men.[1]
> But Fortune sways both sword and scales
> Of Justice, when the Rebel fails.
> Defeated chiefs are always wrong!
> Such is the burden of her song.

The loss of Lord Edward to the cause of the United Irishmen was irretrievable. It might be possible to replace all the other members of the directory after the arrests in March; but there was no substitute to be found in Ireland for Lord Edward. He was the only military man in connection with the Union capable of taking command of any considerable number of men, competent for the important office assigned him, and qualified for it by a knowledge of his profession, practical as well as theoretical. When he was lost to the cause, it was madness to think there was any hope left of a successful issue for resistance.

[1] "Those Whigs and freemen of America, whom you, my lords, call rebels."—Speech of Lord Chatham in 1777.

Lord Edward possessed all the qualities which were requisite for his position, and essential for the kind of warfare that was to be engaged in. Of his chivalrous courage he had given sufficient proofs in America. He had shown military talents at the onset of his career, of a high order: on several occasions he had exhibited remarkable quickness of perception and aptitude for taking advantage of favourable circumstances, and of turning unforeseen opportunities suddenly presenting themselves to a profitable account. He signally distinguished himself in his first engagement with the American forces under one of their most skilful generals.

For the sort of warfare that was expected to ensue in Ireland of a people in revolt, naturally brave, impetuous and turbulent, unaccustomed to military movements, undisciplined, impatient of protracted control; for a warfare against a power in possession of all the strongholds of the country, with a large army constantly being augmented, money and credit without limit for all present wants, and, what is the most formidable of all advantages on its side, a never-failing power of providing fresh resources, of recruiting impaired strength, and supplying exhausted means, men, ammunition, and all the material of war.

One of the wisest and the best of the leaders of the Society of United Irishmen, Thomas

Addis Emmet, chose a telling locality for bearing testimony to the worth and magnanimity of his departed friend in the midst of his enemies.

On his examination before the Secret Committee, when Sir John Parnell addressed these words to him: "Mr. Emmet, while you and the executive were philosophising, Lord Edward was arming and disciplining the people:" Emmet replied: "Lord Edward was a military man; and if he was doing so, he probably thought that was the way in which he could be most useful to his country; but I am sure that if those with whom he acted, were convinced that the grievances of the people were redressed, and that force was become unnecessary, he would have been persuaded to drop all arming and disciplining."

Mr. J. C. Beresford, true in all circumstances to the instinct of his vile nature, could not allow the opportunity to escape of having a dastardly fling at the remains of the dead lion; he said, "I knew Lord Edward Fitzgerald well, and always found him very obstinate."

Emmet: "I knew Lord Edward right well, and have done a great deal of business with him, and have always found, when he had a reliance on the integrity and talents of the person he acted with, he was one of the most persuadable men alive; but if he thought a man meant dishonestly

or unfair by him, he was as obstinate as a mule."[1]

Dr. W. J. M'Neven, whose estimate of men was based on no slight knowledge of the human heart,—a stern thinker and a calm observer, of a philosophical mind, clear in his views, and sober in his judgments,—a man whom I think it a great honour and a high privilege to have known intimately,—thus calmly and deliberately pronounced an opinion on the military talents of Lord Edward, which the good old man's republican tendencies, however much at variance with the sentiments of people living under other institutions, should not be allowed to detract from or to deprive of its just value:—

The Irish nation could not sustain a greater misfortune in the person of any one individual, than befell it in the loss of Fitzgerald at that critical moment. Even his enemies, and he had none but those of this country, allowed him to possess distinguished military talents. With these, with unquestioned intrepidity, republicanism, and devotion to Ireland, with popularity that gave him unbounded influence, and integrity that made him worthy of the highest trust, had he been present in the Irish camp to organize, discipline, and give to the valour of his country a scientific direction, we should have seen the slaves of monarchy fly before the republicans of Ireland, as they did before the patriots of America. And if at last

[1] Report of Evidence before the Secret Committee of the House of Commons.

the tears of his countrymen had been constrained to lament his fate, they would have been received on the laurels of his tomb.

If Lord Edward had been actuated in political life by dishonourable ambition, he had only to cling to his great family connections and parliamentary influence. They unquestionably would have advanced his fortunes and gratified his desires. The voluntary sacrifices he made, and the magnanimous manner in which he directed himself to the independence of Ireland, are incontestable proofs of the purity of his soul.[1]

The founder of the Society of United Irishmen has left, in his journals, a record of his opinion of Lord Edward's character:—

I knew Fitzgerald but very little, but I honour and venerate his character, which he has uniformly sustained, and in this last instance illustrated. What miserable wretches by his side are the gentry of Ireland! I would rather be Fitzgerald, as he is now, wounded in his dungeon, than Pitt at the head of the British empire. What a noble fellow! Of the first family in Ireland, with an easy fortune, a beautiful wife, and a family of lovely children,—the certainty of a splendid appointment under government if he would condescend to support their measures,—he has devoted himself wholly to the emancipation of his country, and sacrificed everything to it, even to his blood.

He is since dead in prison; his career is finished gloriously for himself, and whatever be the event, his

[1] "M'Neven's Pieces of Irish History."

memory will live for ever in the heart of every honest Irishman.[1]

Arthur O'Connor elsewhere echoed the sentiments of Emmet. On this one subject of Lord Edward's purity of mind and disinterestedness of character, there was no difference of opinion.

O'Connor, like Emmet, "knew Lord Edward right well," and though not much given to eulogizing of associates, said: "I never saw in him, I will not say a vice, but a defect. . . . He was the most tolerant of men: he had no enmity to persons."

Even his most strenuous opponents felt the influence and power of his virtues. They were compelled to render homage to them.

"Lord Edward had served with reputation, in the 19th regiment, during a great part of the American war, and on many occasions had displayed great valour and considerable abilities as an officer. When in the army, he was considered as a man of honour and humanity, and was much esteemed by his brother officers for frankness, courage, and good nature—qualities which he was supposed to possess in a very high degree."[2]

Toler, for once in his life, manifested something like emotion in speaking of him:

"Lord Edward Fitzgerald, whose name I never mention without anxiety and grief, and of

[1] T. W. Tone's Memoirs.

[2] Sir Richard Musgrave's "History of the Irish Rebellion."

whom I wish to speak with as much tenderness as possible."[1]

"What a noble fellow," said Lord Byron, "was Lord Edward Fitzgerald, and what a romantic and singular history his was! If it were not too near our times, it would make the finest subject in the world for an historical novel."[2]

There were two portraits of Lord Edward painted by a celebrated Irish artist of the name of Hamilton, which were not finished at the time of Lord Edward's decease. One of these was destined for his mother, and is now, I believe, at Carton; the other for his brother, Lord Henry Fitzgerald.

[1] Speech of the Attorney-General (Toler) on Bond's Trial.
[2] "Medwin's Conversations."

CHAPTER XI

MADAME DE GENLIS

THE question of the relation in which Madame de Genlis stood to Lady Edward Fitzgerald is a mystery which time has not wholly solved, but which it is possible to form a tolerably clear idea of, after a close acquaintance with the vague and conflicting statements of Madame de Genlis in regard to it, and with the views of those who had an intimate knowledge of the person whom Madame de Genlis thought proper to represent as her *elève*. But before the question of that relation is considered, it is necessary to glance at the early history of Madame de Genlis and her subsequent career in the household of the Duc d' Orleans; for these data cannot be ignored by any one who desires to be enabled to form a just or reasonable opinion on the subject of that relation.

Madame de Genlis's character and position in the household of the Duke of Orleans, Louis Philippe Joseph, who adopted the name of Philippe Egalitè in 1792, may be best learned from her own writings—"*Memoires pour Servir a St. Histoire de* 18*ieme et* 19*ieme siecle*" (*en* 8 *tomes* 8*vo,* 1825).

Other ladies of her time and country have likewise written "*Memoires pour Servir,*" but Madame de Genlis transcends all of her cotemporaries in the intensity of her egotism, her personal vanity, and self-conceit. She possessed, however, considerable shrewdness and sagacity, a great deal of talent, no small amount of a capricious kindliness of heart, but strangely associated with a vindictive disposition, strong propensities to slander and to most unscrupulous resentments; and we arrive at phases in her history, when her early love of mystery takes a form of eccentricity that borders on the domain of monomaniacal disorder.

Madame de Genlis tells us she was born in 1746, in Burgundy, near Autun, of parents in a respectable position, possessing landed property and a chateau, and by purchase a title to nobility. She was conducted to Lyons when she was about the age of six years, and placed in the convent of ladies of noble origin in Alex, in due time to be received there. In this order of canonesses those who were received were at liberty to make their profession at any subsequent period they pleased, but in the interim they were at liberty to live out of the convent. The young lady recently received departed very soon after her arrival in the convent. Her father, Monsieur Ducrest, superintended her education. His sole idea was to make her *une femme forte.*

The idea of her governess, Mademoiselle Mars, was to make her a heroine—an actress,—and her success in the latter aim was remarkable. The young *elève* played *l'amour* admirably in a little *opera comique* got up by her mother, and also in the part of Agathe in "*Les Folies Amoreuses*" with great effect. The *bizarre* education she received, and the recreations she indulged in, "had a great influence on all her future life," she tells us. "There was a *melange* of religious impressions and romantic ideas," she says, "in her early years, in her imagination," which was but too apparent in the greater number of the works subsequently written by her. "She was then easily led and naturally complaisant." But she had a "precious instinct" of knowing people at a glance who were naturally in a state of antipathy with her disposition and feelings. Hence she entertained strong dislikes to people who were not in harmony with her disposition. A little later she learned to sing, to dance, to play the harpsichord, and was taught the use of fire-arms. But religious exercises in the evening were never forgotten.

At the age of fourteen or fifteen she accompanied her mother to Paris, and after a short residence there, mother and daughter took up their fixed abode at Passy, where they lived *en grand train,* and in a round of gaieties, while the

father of the happy family at Passy was trying to retrieve his embarrassed affairs in Burgundy, and at length was obliged to go to St. Domingo to seek to repair his fortune. After a few years' sojourn in that island he returned to Europe. The vessel he embarked in was taken by the English; he was conveyed to Launceston as a prisoner of war, and with him the lieutenant of the vessel in which he was captured, Monsieur de Genlis, subsequently Count de Genlis and Marquess de Sillery, an officer of distinguished bravery. M. de Genlis had frequent opportunities of seeing his fellow-prisoner's letters from his daughter, and likewise a portrait of her, which he admired exceedingly.

Having obtained his liberty before his companion and fellow-prisoner, he returned to France, and soon having an opportunity of seeing the original of that portrait, there was nothing left for him but to fall desperately in love with the young lady, and to marry her in due time, her family being then in the most straitened circumstances. Her father (on his liberation from an English prison and return to his own country) had become an inmate of a prison in Paris for debt for which he only came out to die with his family. It was after his death in 1764 that the Count de Genlis paid his addresses to his daughter and was accepted by her, the count

being then under an engagement of marriage contracted for him by a minister of the crown with his full consent. The marriage was a secret one, and was performed at midnight. The friends of the count were so much displeased at this alliance, they refused for a long time to visit him or to recognize his lady.

The issue of that marriage was a daughter, Caroline, born in 1765, of whom Madame speaks as an angelic creature who, during twenty-two years, constituted the happiness and glory of her life. She married the Marquess of Lawoestine about 1779, and died the following year.

A second daughter, Pulcherie, born in 1776, married General Valence about 1784, who was subsequently involved in General Dumouriez's treason; and, lastly, a son, who died in childhood in 1775.

Madame de Genlis was presented at the court of Louis the Fifteenth, and was graciously received by the king, and several members of the royal family; and with this presentation commenced the relations with the Orleans family which had so great an influence on her future life.

In the midst of her grandeur and her gaieties, the countess says she preserved a *penchant* for instructing children, which was always a dominant passion with her. She took into her service a little girl named Rose, the daughter of one of

her domestics, whom she instructed in music and taught to play the harp.

The manners of the court of Louis the Fifteenth appear to have exerted anything but a favourable influence on the mind of the countess. She relates with apparent enjoyment the pleasure she experienced in providing herself and her sister-in-law a milk bath with rose leaves strewn over the surface, "*ce charmant bain—ce bain de lait qui est la plus agreable chose du monde.*" The baignoire which had to be provided with milk, was the largest, she states, she had ever seen; it was large enough to contain three persons; and yet this woman had seen her father thrown into prison for debt, and her mother reduced at one time to the necessity of soliciting a loan of a small sum of money from her sister for the common necessaries of life; and in the latter part of her own career she was sometimes almost in want of them.

From the time of her marriage to the period of her presentation at court, we read in the memoirs of nothing but balls and festivities, and preparations for private theatricals, and performances of comedies and operas, in which the countess always took a leading part. She performed frequently before the royal family. In an account of one of these performances, the name of a new actor, that of the Duc d' Orleans, father of Egalitè, is for the first time *mise en*

scene in the memoirs. "Monsieur le Duc d'Orleans, *jouoit fort rondement les roles des paysans.*" At this period, the countess states, the Duke was in love with her aunt, Madame de Montesson, *plantoniquement,* and her aunt was in love, ambitiously, with the poor duke.[1]

About 1768 the Duc d'Orleans had offered to espouse her aunt secretly, but the lady had refused the offer without the consent of his son, the Duc de Chartres. The young duke refused, and resisted for a long time all solicitations for that consent, till at length a kind of approval was drawn from him, the lady having promised to defer the nuptials for two years.

In 1770, the countess, after many solicitations on the part of the duke to accept a situation in the household of the Duke de Chartres, then recently married and established in the Palais Royal, at length consented, and the day of taking up her abode in the Palais Royal she calls *"le jour fatale,"* wherein Louis Philippe, Duc d'Orleans, having died in 1773, he was succeeded by his son, then Duc de Chartres, Louis Philippe

[1] Louis Philippe, Duc d'Orleans, grandson of the regent (and father of Egalitè), was born 1725, bore the title of Duc de Chartres till his father's death. In 1759 he became a widower, and assuaged his grief for the loss of his wife by constructing a theatre on one of his properties, Bagnolet, where he distinguished himself in the performance of the parts of peasants and adventurers. His morganatic marriage with Madame de Montesson, the aunt of Madame de Genlis, took place in 1773. He died in 1785.

Joseph d' Orleans, of infamous notoriety as Philippe Egalitè, who was born in 1747. In 1769 he married Adelaide de Bourbon, only daughter of the Duc de Penthièvre, whose virtues formed a strong contrast with the vices of her husband. In 1789 his machinations against the court caused his temporary exile in England. Restored to his country, he repaid the generosity of Louis the Sixteenth by voting for his death a little later; and Louis the Sixteenth having been put to death the 21st of January, 1793, Robespierre repaid Egalitè for his services to the revolution by sending him to the Abbaye, then to prison at Marseilles, and on the 6th of November 1793, he was guillotined in Paris. By his marriage with the excellent Madame Adelaide de Bourbon, he had several children—Louis Philippe, subsequently King of the French, the Duc de Montpensier, the Comte de Beaujolais, and Madame Adelaide.

These were the children of whose education Madame de Genlis treats so largely in her memoirs, as likewise of that of Pamela, of whose mysterious origin she has given a detailed account.[1]

[1] The issue of Louis Philippe Joseph Duc d'Orleans (Egalitè), by his marriage with Louise Marie Adelaide de Bourbon, only daughter of the Duc de Penthièvre (1769), was five children.—1.—Louis Philippe d'Orleans, Duc de Valois and de Chartres, born in 1773, King of the French, 7th August, 1830, died 26th August, 1850.

When Madame de Genlis entered the Palais Royal as *dame d'honneur* to the Duchesse de Chartres, in 1770, she was in her twenty-fourth year. The Duc de Chartres, the future Egalitè, was in his twenty-third year, and had been married in 1769, only the year before Madame de Genlis's *entrée* into the Palais Royal, and all at once seems to have risen to the highest favour and most influential position there. If suspicions were not silenced, appearances were saved to some extent by giving her husband a nominal appointment in the household—that of captain of the guards of the Duc d' Orleans.

The fact of the utter ruin and embarrassment, of the pecuniary circumstances and financial affairs of the Duke of Orleans at the period of the outbreak of the French Revolution, throws much light on his conduct in regard to the crown and government of Louis XVI. The historian and panegyrist of the Duke of Orleans, Monsieur Tournois, says, " The Duke of Orleans had always secretly suffered financial embarrass-

2.—Antoine Philippe d'Orleans, Duc de Montpensier, born in 1775, died in 1807.

3.—Louis Charles d'Orleans, Comte de Beaujolais, born in 1779, died in 1808.

4 and 5.—Eugenie Adelaide Louise d'Orleans, born in 1777, died 31st December, 1847; and a twin sister, who died in 1782.

Louis Philippe, Joseph d'Orleans (Egalitè), born in 1747, died on the scaffold, 6th November, 1793. The consort of the preceding—the Duchesse Douaire d'Orleans, born in 1753—died in 1821.

ments: these embarrassments were much talked of in 1790, and becoming more serious and alarming in 1791, they terminated in inextricable disorder, and reached the brink of an inevitable catastrophe in 1792."[1]

And it is to be observed that this ruin of the financial affairs of the duke is attributed in a great degree by Monsieur Tournois to the brother of Madame de Genlis, Monsieur Ducrest, whom she had contrived to get appointed Chancellier de Maison d' Orleans.

The position of the Comtesse de Genlis in the household of the Duchess d' Orleans was anomalous in the extreme. She was suspected by the whole court of the Palais Royal to be the mistress of the duke. She was placed near the person of the duchess, she was the secretary of the duchess, wrote all her letters, and eventually obtained the office of *gouverneur* of the male children of the Duke and Duchess d' Orleans, and of *gouvernante* of the young princess Adelaide, which offices she filled for nearly fifteen years. The amiable and religious duchess saw her children taken from her, removed to another establishment, where the Countess of Genlis was supreme director and mistress, found the affection of her children estranged from her, and, as she thought, the affections of her husband scan-

[1] "Histoire de Louis Philippe d'Orleans," par Monsieur Tournois.

dalously inveigled by an artful, intriguing, ambitious woman; and it was only when her peace of mind was utterly destroyed, that she summoned sufficient courage to assert her rights. The conduct of Madame de Genlis on this occasion was insolent and indiscreet, indelicate and unwomanly. She kept her ground for a short time, set the duchess at defiance, but wrote her long treatises on morality and the education of princes and princesses, and the duties of mothers and the prerogatives of governesses, in the form of letters. However, when further resistance was in vain, she indignantly abandoned her office, quitted the establishment where she had virtually reigned over the Duke of Orleans and his family for so many years, but not before she addressed letters to the children who were lately her pupils, calculated to poison their minds against their mother, and to make herself appear indispensable to their happiness.

But of the result of this triumph of Madame de Genlis, it will be in vain to look for any account in the memoirs of that lady; we must seek for it in the biography of her patron and protector, the Duke of Orleans, by M. Tournois, and there we find that the Duchess of Orleans, on the 5th of April, 1791, took the grave resolution of a final separation from her husband, abandoned the Palais Royal, and retired to her father's abode, le Chateau d'Eu, in Normandy.

The family of her father, the Duke de Penthièvre, took immediate proceedings to effect a formal separation *de corps et de biens,* and eventually on the 8th of October, 1793, by a decree of the Tribunal of Cassation, the separation was definitely established, and the claim of the duchess on the property of her husband was confirmed to a settlement of an enormous amount, in virtue of the marriage contract, by which a dowry of six millions of livres had been secured by her father.

When the Court of Cassation pronounced its judgment, the Duke of Orleans was then a prisoner in Marseilles, destined in a few weeks to be conveyed to Paris to appear personally before another tribunal, from which he was conducted to the scaffold, where, some months previously, his relative the King of France had made his exit, and for whose death he, Louis Philippe Joseph d' Orleans, had given his vote. And at the same period, when that judgment of the Court of Cassation was pronounced, the Duchess of Orleans was a prisoner in Normandy, separated effectually from her husband by a distance of three hundred leagues.

Madame de Genlis had taken good care in the meantime of all that was precious to her in the world—herself. She was then secure from the storms of the Revolution in Flanders, and there, a little later, she had leisure to devote a few para-

graphs in her memoirs to many ruins she had very largely contributed to accomplish.

The duchess, however, had for a long period, it will be borne in mind, previous to the separation, stifled her feelings of just resentment and consented to be dragged about on tours of pleasure and promenades for health, to fashionable watering places, by her unfeeling and unprincipled consort, rather in the charge and under the direction of madame la gouvernante, than attended by a woman who had been in her household in the capacity of a lady-in-waiting. In 1784 she was thus humiliated by her unworthy husband, taken to Spa, and paraded before the public side by side with a woman generally believed to be the paramour of her husband. Upwards of eight years previously, Madame de Genlis had also visited Spa, but on that occasion she was accompanied by the Duke or Duchess d'Orleans or her husband; and then and there Pamela believed she was born, and that her mother was Madame la Comtesse de Genlis.

It was in the spring of 1791 that the poor Duchess d'Orleans made the desperate effort, previously referred to, to separate her children from Madame de Genlis, and to induce the latter to resign her office of governess. The conduct of Madame de Genlis on this occasion was infamous: she refused to resign her office or to restore the children of the duchess. She wrote

letters of complaint to the husband against the wife; she had the audacity even to demand of the husband his interference with the wife, and to call for an apology from the injured lady. But the duchess, at length assuming the authority of her position, demanded of Madame de Genlis her immediate departure and resignation of her office, on pain of a public exposure of her conduct; and then only, and not till then, Madame de Genlis reluctantly abandoned her office of governess, and removed from Paris. But the triumph of the virtuous and excellent woman, the Duchess of Orleans, was of short duration. The artful, intriguing, ever-plotting, never-tiring concocter of schemes and stratagems, was recalled to Paris by the duke not long before his arrest, brought back to Belle-chasse, reinstated in her office, and sent to England in charge of the eldest daughter of the Duke of Orleans, her former *elève,* Madame Adelaide.

The biographer and panegyrist of the Duc d' Orleans (*Egalitè*), speaking of his marriage in 1769, says: "The Duke and the Duchess d'Orleans had been in tolerable harmony, *assez unis,* till the year 1784. At this epoch some clouds gathered over their union; the family seasonably interfered; everything was arranged. But these reconciliations do not always last, because the women never forget, at least entirely, certain things," *les femmes n'oublient jamais, du moins*

entierement certaines choses. The biographer leaves us in no doubt of the nature of these *certaines choses.* We are plainly informed the duchess believed (unreasonably, of course, we are told by the panegyrist of Egalitè) that Madame de Genlis had supplanted her in the affections of her husband, and had usurped her position in her own family and household.

The biographers of Louis Philippe are of accord in regard to Madame de Genlis; they eulogize her, and they either omit all mention of her *elève,* Pamela, or make some slight references to her adoption by Madame de Genlis. Monsieur Amedèe Boudin, in his "*Histoire de Louis Philippe,*" apparently written by the order of the Orleanists, and in entire conformity with their views and interests, enters largely into the history of the education of the young Orleanist princes and princesses, but has not one word respecting the companion of their studies, the young and beautiful Pamela.

Of all the celebrated women of France of the time of Louis XVI. and the Revolution, renowned for their wit, intellectuality, brilliant talents for society, for literature, or for proficiency of any kind in letters, several were more immoral than the Countess de Genlis, but none were more hypocritical, intensely egotistic, unscrupulous, and malignant in their resentment than this lady.

There are two passages in the memoirs which speak volumes for the intensity of the feeling of self-love and the fanaticism of self-worship of Madame de Genlis. She commences the volume of memoirs with a relation of the greatest event of modern times in the following terms:—

"The Revolution broke out the 9th of July (1789): it was the eve of the *fete,* which they were celebrating at St. Leu with charming entertainments (spectacles).

The eternal *moi* predominated then, as it did to the close of the career of this poor, ambitious, artful woman.

The countess terminates her memoirs (published in 1825), vol. v., p. 91, in these terms of astounding presumption and impiety:—"Now, I have terminated my memoirs, I can say, if not with the merits at least with the truth, these words of the apostle—'*I have fought well. I have kept the faith. I have finished my course.*'"

Proscribed as an emigrant in 1793, Madame de Genlis wandered from asylum to asylum, in Flanders, Switzerland, Germany, and Prussia, to the period of the Consulate, when permission was given to her by Buonaparte to return to France. Paris then became her fixed place of abode, and there the remainder of her life was spent.

Madame de Genlis terminated her eventful

career in Paris the 31st of December, 1830, at the age of eighty-five years. She had the gratification of seeing her *elève* Louis Philippe elevated to the throne of France. Her remains were followed to their resting place, the cemetery of Mont Valerien, by the royal carriages of her august pupil. Early in the month of November, 1831, the beloved *elève,* if not the daughter, of Madame de Genlis, the once beautiful Pamela, ended also her most strange and eventful history in Paris. The interval that separated the deaths of Madame de Genlis and Pamela was ten months and eight days.

I endeavoured to obtain a copy of the will of Madame de Genlis, but found that no registry of wills exists in France; and no person except those beneficially interested in the property of the deceased, are legally entitled to see the will of a deceased person (with the custody of which the notary who makes the will is always charged).

No mention of Pamela, I am informed, is made in the will of Madame de Genlis.

The persons who inherit any property left by her are the representatives of her grandchildren: La Comtesse Gerard, the daughter of Madame Valence, and widow of the late Marshal Gerard; and the General de Lawoestine, the present commandant en chef of the National Guard of Paris, son of the Marquis de Lawoestine who

married the other daughter of Madame de Genlis.

Madame de Genlis died in Paris in a boarding-house kept by Madame d'Afforty, No. 24 Rue Faubourg du Roule, now Faubourg St. Honore, the hotel of the Swedish Legation.

CHAPTER XII

THE ORIGIN OF PAMELA

THE peculiar turn of mind, and the ruling passion of Madame de Genlis's life, was an intense love of fabrication, and imposing on the world the fictions of her lively imagination, and the mystification of all surrounding circumstances, for facts and realities.

With a degree of candour very seldom exhibited by Madame de Genlis in her Memoirs, referring to the period of her marriage, 1764, she acknowledges that "from her earliest youth, under the dominion of her imagination, she always loved better to occupy herself with that which she created (in her own imagination) than with that which existed." She continues—"I never considered the future except as a dream, in which every object can be introduced that is desired. It appeared to me very insipid to put there only things likely to occur, which can be discovered by all the world. *I had no pretensions to the power of foreseeing, but I had to that of inventing.*[1]

[1] *Dominèe par mon imagination et dès mon enfance, j'ai toujours mieux aimè m'occuper de ce que je creais que de ce qui etait. Je n'ai jamais considere l'avenir que comme un reve ou l'on peut placer tout ce qu'on veut.*

Il me paraissait fort insipide de n'y mettre que le vraisem-

New Ross

After an Original Drawing in the Possession of the Editor

LIBERTY

Madame de Genlis entered the Palais Royal as lady in waiting to the Duchesse de Chartres (a little later Duchesse d' Orleans) in 1770.

The Duc d' Orleans appears from the first to have patronized the young lady in waiting. She soon became in her own estimation an important person in the court and family of the young duke and duchess.

She accompanied them in their tours; she controlled their servants. She governed the family, while ostensibly only appearing to guide the education of the children of it.

In 1777 she was installed, as we have already seen, by her patron the Duc d' Orleans, of infamous notoriety, in the establishment connected with the convent of Belle-chasse in Paris, charged with the education of his children.[1] Referring to this period of her career, the name of Pamela is thus first introduced in the "*Memoires*" of Madame de Genlis—

"It is true that to perfect my *elèves* in the habit of speaking foreign languages, I conceived the idea of placing along with them a little Eng-

blable, que tout le monde pouvait y voir. Je n'avais la pretension de la prevoyance mais j'avais celle de l'invention.—Memoires de M. de Genlis, Ed. Barba, ch. viii., p. 19.

[1] Although the references to the Memoires of M. de Genlis, in this volume, are for the most part to the first edition, which appeared in 1825, yet on account of the omission of dates to a great extent in that edition, the later one, published by Barba and edited by the niece of Madame de Genlis, in which that omission is supplied in the notes and headings of chapters, has been made use of accordingly.—R. R. M.

lish girl nearly their own age. A little girl who was then residing in Paris, was first brought to me; but I found her so disagreeable that I did not wish to keep her. Then Monsieur le Duc de Chartres wrote to London, and charged a person he was acquainted with, Mons. Forth, to send him a pretty little English girl of five or six years of age, after having her inoculated. This commission was a little long in executing, as Mr. Forth had at first selected one, but on examination by doctors it was found she had a tendency to scrofula. A month afterwards he found another, whom he had inoculated, whom he confided to a horse dealer named St. Denis, who had been charged by the Duc de Chartres to purchase for him a fine English horse. He announced to Monsieur le Duc the execution of the commission in these terms: "I have the honour to send to your most serene highness the handsomest mare and the prettiest girl in England." The next reference to Pamela in the Memoirs is in connection with occurrences which took place in December, 1792.

Pamela was the daughter of a gentleman of good family (*qui avait de la naissance*) named Seymour, who had married against the consent of his family, a person of the lowest condition, named Mary Syms, and took her to Newfoundland, to a place called Fogo. There Pamela was born, and was named Nancy.

Her father died, and the mother returned to England with her child, then eighteen months old. As her husband was disinherited, she was reduced to great misery, and forced to work for her bread. She had settled at Christ Church, which place Mr. Forth passed through four years after, and being commissioned by the Duke of Orleans to send us a young English girl, he saw this girl, and obtained her from her mother. When I began to be really attached to Pamela, I was very uneasy lest her mother might be desirous of claiming her by legal process; that is, lest she might threaten me with doing so, to obtain grants of money it would have been out of my power to give. I consulted several English lawyers on the subject, and they told me that the only means of protecting myself from this species of persecution, was to get the mother to give me her daughter as an apprentice for the sum of twenty-five guineas. She agreed, and, according to the usual forms, appeared in the Court of King's Bench before Lord Chief Justice Mansfield. She there signed an agreement, by which she gave me her daughter as an apprentice till she became of age, and could not claim her from me till she paid all the expenses I had been at for her maintenance and education; and to this paper Lord Mansfield put his name and seal, as Lord Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench.[1]

In 1788, Madame de Genlis determined to make *un petit voyage en Angleterre,* for which petit voyage no reasons are assigned in the memoirs, except that "she had always a passionate

[1] "Memoires de Madame de Genlis."—Edition de Madame Georgette Ducrest, Barba, Paris, ch. xx., p. 104.

desire for a little journey to England." And this was the only occasion, she states, in which she had ever separated herself from her *elèves* during their education, and it was only for six weeks."[1] She received the most flattering attentions, she states, from the persons the most celebrated of England; among others, from Messrs. Fox, Sheridan, Burke, Lord Mansfield, etc., etc., etc.; with all of whom she had never any previous acquaintance. On her birth-day, Lord Mansfield, *grand juge d'Angleterre,* sent her a present of moss roses, *ce respectable veillard,* whom she had only seen a few days before for the first time, was particularly obliging to her. But not one word is said in this account of the journey, and her intimacy with the chief justice, of the legal proceeding before Lord Mansfield, in virtue of which Pamela became an apprentice of Madame de Genlis.

All the details given by Madame de Genlis of the origin of Pamela, I believe to be mere fictions, and such they were considered by Pamela and those intimately acquainted with her.

Pamela was not the only "child of adoption" of Madame de Genlis.

A new *elève* and "child of adoption" of

[1] In October, 1789, the Duke of Orleans, who the year preceding had been exiled from Paris, and compelled to reside at one of his estates, was permitted to go to England. Madame de Genlis visited England in October, 1788. In all probability her visit was connected with the duke's to that country a little later.

Madame la Gouvernante makes a first appearance on the stage of that mystifying lady's "Memoires," about the latter part of 1799, when reference is made to a second visit of her's to Berlin. The scene of this new mysterious episode in the life and adventures of Madame de Genlis, of the "adoption" kind, is, however, laid in Prussia, on the occasion of Madame's first visit to Berlin, which was in the spring of 1795.

The recollection of dates is very important in this matter. Madame and her *elève,* the Princesse d' Orleans, had been living in a secluded manner in Switzerland, in the convent of Bregmarten, for upwards of a year previously to the second journey of Madame to Berlin. She manifested, however, a strong desire, and one that was quite new also, and inconsistent with former procedures, to be *debarassée* of Mademoiselle d'Orleans in the early part of 1794. She accordingly caused the young princess to address her illustrious relations in various countries soliciting an asylum. One of these applications was successful; an asylum was offered to her by her aunt the Princess de Conti, then residing in another canton of Switzerland.

Madame and her *elève* separated finally the 11th of May, 1794. The former immediately after this separation set out for Germany, and at the close of July, 1794, was sojourning at

Altona. The 1st of April, 1795, she set out from Altona for Hamburgh, where she remained four months, and then proceeded to Berlin, where she sojourned for a much longer period, and eventually was expelled from the Prussian dominions by the government, but for what cause no satisfactory account is given in the memoirs. Some five years later, towards the latter part of 1801, notwithstanding the indignity which Madame de Genlis had suffered in Berlin, we find that lady, having obtained permission to return to Prussia, again residing in Berlin, and after a short sojourn there, coming away accompanied with a little boy of about six years of age. The new "child of adoption," to whom Madame de Genlis had given the name of Casimir, plays the same *role* Pamela had done in the memoirs some years previously. The following is the account of this new adoption given by Madame, who so candidly informs us that "she was always under the dominion of her imagination even from childhood, and always loved better to occupy herself with that which she created than with that which really existed." Madame thus proceeds:—

> There lived in a house a tailor who had been twice married, and had the second time espoused a young woman who had two children by her first marriage. The eldest, who was very badly treated by his unjust step-father, came often to take refuge at my house, when the violence of his conduct became unbearable.

His good looks, his misfortunes, and superior intelligence interested me greatly. I gave him lessons in reading, writing, and French. At the end of four months he was master of all I had taught him, learning by heart both verse and prose. He recited them without any fault of pronunciation. I went to his mother to beg her to give me up the care of this child, promising her that I would bring him up in the Catholic religion. To this proposal she consented, and gave me a written engagement to make over to me all her rights to the boy. She appeared even delighted to give him up to me. I took him with me, and gave him the name of Casimir, after my son, whom I had lost; . . . I then took my leave of those people who had been so very kind to me.[1]

Of Casimir's subsequent career, we find numerous accounts in the memoirs of his mother "by adoption." He was the youngest of that kind of children of Madame, and all her affection in her latter years seems to have centred in him. At the time of the revolution of July, 1830, he was residing in Paris, a young man of considerable merit as an artist, a musician of great talent, and, what was of far higher importance, a person of great worth and moral excellence. When Madame de Genlis was on her death-bed in December, 1830, she addressed a communication to the new King of the French, her former pupil, soliciting his bounty and protection for her

[1] "Chroniques Populaire Memoires de Madame de Genlis." Par Georgette Ducrest, Paris, p. 117.

young *elève* Casimir, for whom she was unable to make any provision. The result of this application was a pension which Mons. Casimir ceased only to receive at the downfall of Louis Philippe, and which for Louis Napoleon to restore would be an act of generosity well applied.

But to return to the first child by adoption of Madame de Genlis. In April, 1776, we are told by that lady in her memoirs, that she was ordered by her physician, after a serious illness *La Rugeole,* to try the mineral waters of Spa; and as her husband could not accompany her, she proceeded to Spa attended by an elderly officer, a friend of her husband, "*un homme en qui il avait toute confiance.*"

There, after a sojourn of nearly four months, she applied for a renewal of her leave of absence, to make a tour in Switzerland. She returned to Paris in the autumn of 1776, after an absence of five months and a half.[1]

If a statement of Pamela to a friend of hers, Madame la Baronne d'E., be correct, that she was four years younger than Madame de Genlis made her out, she must have been born in 1777. The inference, then, about Madame de Genlis's motive for the journey to Spa would fall to the ground: if she had stated three years instead of four, we would then have the date of her birth

[1] Barba's edition of the "Memoires," edited by M. Georgette Duerest, p. 65.

and that of the journey of Madame de Genlis to Spa the same year, namely, 1776, and consequently Pamela would have been sixteen years of age, and not nineteen, when she was married.

The time of Madame de Genlis's journey to Spa in 1776, and the date of the birth of Pamela, if separated at all, I believe can only be so by an interval of some months.

Pamela was born, according to Madame de Genlis's account, in 1773, being about nineteen in October, 1792, as she is described in the marriage contract.[1]

But on authority which is entitled to the fullest reliance, that of the intimate and confidential friend of Pamela for many years, and who continued so to be up to the period of her death—Madame la Baronne d'E., I am enabled to state that Pamela on many occasions referred to Madame de Genlis's account of her age as a misstatement, the design of which was to have her (Pamela) believed to be some years older than she really was, for reasons connected with Madame de Genlis's position at that period in the Duc d' Orleans' household.

I have no doubt of the truth of that statement. But it will be seen by a written communication

[1] In Madame de Genlis's "Memoires" (en 10 tomes, Paris, 1825), we find an account of her first entrance into the service of the Duchess de Chartres, afterwards d'Orleans, the date of which event it is important to bear in mind, the year 1770, when she was twenty-four years of age.

of my informant, that Pamela claimed to be four years younger than Madame de Genlis had been pleased to admit. Pamela's statement, most probably, approached nearest to the truth. It is necessary, however, to reduce the four years, of which she speaks, to three years, to make her account consistent with many concurrent circumstances which suffice to fix the date of her birth with tolerable certainty at 1776, instead of 1773, as Madame de Genlis would have it, and to establish the fact that, at the period of her marriage, in the latter part of 1792, she was only sixteen years of age, and not nineteen, as Madame de Genlis made her out.

The kind of education given to Pamela by Madame de Genlis was better calculated to qualify her for the stage than for the position in society that might be desired of her.

Madame de Genlis makes mention of a performance of her *elève,* Pamela, then about twelve years of age, in a pantomime got up by the countess at St. Leu, for the entertainment of David, the celebrated painter, on which occasion "Love" was personated by the beautiful little Pamela.

In the course of the education of my *elèves,* we played successively in our *salle de comedie,* all the dramatic pieces of my "Thetre"; the children also played pantomimes there. There was one so remarkable that

I cannot pass it over in silence: it was that of "Psyche persecuted by Venus"; Madame de Lawoestine, then fifteen years old, represented "Venus," her sister "Psyche," and Pamela that of "Love." There never were three persons together who united so much beauty and grace.

About the year 1785, Madame de Genlis gives a portrait of the young Pamela, who previously *avait toute son esprit en l'intelligence: et qui l'a montrés depuis dans la conversation et dans ses lettres:*

Pamela was extremely handsome; candour and sensibility were the chief traits in her character; she never told a falsehood, or employed the slightest deceit, during the whole course of her education; she was spiritual from sentiment; her conversation was most agreeable, and always emanated from the heart. I was passionately fond of her, and that fondness has in some respect proved unfortunate. This charming child was the most idle I ever knew; she had no memory—she was very wild, which even added to the grace of her figure, as it gave her an air of vivacity, which, joined with her natural indolence and to a great deal of wit, made her very engaging. Her figure was fine and light; she flew like Atalante; and her mind was idle to the greatest degree; thus was she in after life a person the least capable of reflection. Her lot brought her afterwards into the most extraordinary situations; she was without a guide or a counsellor on a thousand dangerous occasions, but, nevertheless,

conducted herself extremely well as long as her husband was living, and even, in many difficult circumstances, in a manner truly heroic.—(*Mem. Madame de Genlis*, vol. iii., p. 139.)

In July, 1789, the French Revolution broke out, and an occurrence took place a little later, we are told in the Memoirs, which caused Madame de Genlis to desire to make a second *petit voyage en Angleterre;* but this desire was not gratified until the 11th of October, 1791, when la Duchesse d' Orleans had insisted on Madame de Genlis's expulsion from Belle-chasse.

The occurrence to which Madame de Genlis refers is remarkable. At the age of little more than fourteen years, we find Pamela already made practically acquainted with the terrors of a revolution, menaced with death, imprisoned during a whole night by a furious rabble yelling *a la lanterne.* The following is the account given in Madame de Genlis's Memoirs of this early experience of the horrors of a revolution in 1790.

The Count de Beaujolais, my niece, Henriette de Sercey, Pamela, and I, went to visit a country house, six leagues from Paris. We passed by the Colombe. Unfortunately it was a market-day. There were assembled in the village a multitude of people from the neighbouring parts. As we traversed the village the people crowded round our carriage, imagining that I was the queen, accompanied by Madame (her daugh-

ter) and the Dauphin, who had fled from Paris. They arrested us, obliged us to descend from the carriage, on which they seized, as well as on the coachman and our attendants. In this state of the tumult, the commandant of the national guard, a young man of very good family, Monsieur Baudry, came to our succour, harangued the people, whom he could not dissuade however; but he managed to gain their permission to conduct us into his house which was quite close, undertaking to keep us prisoners till full satisfaction was given by us. Through an immense multitude we were led into his house, and during this short passage we heard a great number of voices and of furious cries that we must be brought to the lamp-posts—*a la lanterne.* Finally we were taken into the house; but a quarter of an hour had not elapsed before a multitude of 4,000 people besieged the doors, burst them open, and rushed into the house with a terrible tumult. M. Baudry acted with much courage and humanity, and made all the efforts in his power to calm the populace. We were in the garden, and when I heard the people approaching, I told my *elèves* to commence playing immediately the game of four corners with me. Instantly a frightful crowd of men and women rushed into the garden; they were much surprised to find us playing at this game; we ceased playing on the spot, however, and I approached towards them with the greatest calm. I told them I was the wife of one of their deputies; that I was about to write a letter to Paris to clear up all things, which letter I prayed them to despatch by a courier. They listened to me; but after some time they cried out that it was all lies I

told; that I wanted to write to Paris in order to have an armed force sent for our release.—(*Mem. Madame de Genlis,* vol. iv., p. 4.)

The conclusion may be told in fewer words than Madame de Genlis has employed to relate it. After a long debate the proposition was accepted. A man was despatched to Paris to make the necessary inquiry of the authorities. A guard was set over the house, the populace continued to besiege it during the night, and during that frightful night until five o'clock the following morning the tumult continued, and drunkenness lent additional horrors to it. At that hour of the morning, the messenger returned with an order from the muncipality to allow the party to proceed without molestation, and that order was obeyed. But, however calm and composed Madame de Genlis may have been, we may easily conceive what the terror must have been of her young *elèves,* of M. le Comte de Beaujolais, Mademoiselle d'Orleans, Henriette de Sercy, the niece of Madame de Genlis, and the young Pamela. This incident in the French reign of terror was an introduction for her to another reign of terror, the events of which it was her unfortunate destiny to be familiarized with in Ireland.

CHAPTER XIII

MARRIAGE OF PAMELA

DURING the sojourn of Madame de Genlis in England in 1792, with her *elève* the Princesse Adelaide d'Orleans and her reputed daughter Pamela, she formed an acquaintance that became of a very intimate nature with the celebrated Richard Brinsley Sheridan.

When the importunities of the Duke d' Orleans could no longer be resisted for his daughter's return to France, in order to avoid the penalty of the impending project of a law against all French subjects residing in foreign countries without the sanction of the government, Madame de Genlis very reluctantly prepared for her departure, and at length tore herself and her young *elèves* away from the charming society of Mr. Sheridan, which, it appears, they had enjoyed a good deal of in the autumn of 1792. They set out for Dover, but they had to pass, we learn from Madame de Genlis, through a town called Dartford, and the thought of the dreadful dangers three unprotected ladies in a foreign land would be exposed to, at the moment of starting even, filled the soul of Madame la Gouvernante with terrors, and long sub-

sequently filled many pages of her memoirs with a most romantic account of the perfidy of a postillion and the perils resulting therefrom, having been purposely taken by a wrong road to a considerable distance from the proper route, evidently with some mysterious and sinister design on the part of the postillion. At length, however, owing to a great display of courage on the part of Madame, and the happy interference of some country people whom she had appealed to, the perfidious postillion was induced by divers menaces of prosecution to return to London, the place from which they had fruitlessly set out several hours previously for Dover. They had no sooner reached London than Madame drove directly to the place of abode of Mr. Sheridan, and there the lady and her *elèves* found a hospitable asylum, and continued in the enjoyment of it for about one month.

Moore, in the "Memoirs of R. B. Sheridan" in reference to the romantic account of Madame de Genlis, of the terror and perils which beset her route in that alarming journey of hers and her *elèves* between London and Dartford—terrors equal to those which surrounded her on a former occasion at the idea of "crossing the desert plains of Newmarket without an escort," says:—

It is impossible to read this narrative with the recol-

lection at the same time in our minds of the boyish propensity of Sheridan to what are called practical jokes, without strongly suspecting that he was himself the contriver of the whole adventure. The ready attendance of the justice; the "unknown gentleman" deposed to by the post-boys; the disappearance of the laquais; and the advice given by Sheridan that the affair should be pursued no further—all strongly savour of dramatic contrivance, and must have afforded a scene not a little trying to the gravity of him who took the trouble of getting it up. With respect to his motive, the agreeable month at his country-house sufficiently explains it; nor could his conscience have felt much scruples about an imposture, which, so far from being attended with any disagreeable consequences, furnished the lady with an incident of romance, of which she was but too happy to avail herself, and procured for him the presence of such a distinguished party, to grace and enliven the festivities of Isleworth.

The time that Sheridan had selected for this supposed practical joke, with the view of enlivening the festivities of Isleworth, was somewhat singular, making every fit and proper allowance even for all that is singular and anomalous in the eccentricities and vagaries of men of genius. His first wife (the once beautiful and accomplished Miss Linley, and who, not long even before her death, was looked upon as "the connecting link between woman and angel") had not been dead above four months: for it will

be borne in mind, that her death took place June 28, 1792; and we find it stated by Madame de Genlis, in her Memoirs, that she finally took her leave of Mr. Sheridan, after her prolonged sojourn at his house in Isleworth, with her two *elèves,* and set out for Dover the latter end of November, 1792, after having remained one month at Mr. Sheridan's. Consequently, she must have arrived there towards the end of October or beginning of November, four months after the death of Mrs. Sheridan.

Sheridan, at the age of twenty, had eloped, at Bath, with a young lady of eighteen, the celebrated Miss Linley, so renowned for her beauty, musical talents, fascinating manners, and amiable character. They were married at a little village near Calais, by a Catholic clergyman, the latter end of March, 1772. The newly married couple returned to Bath, but kept their marriage secret till the month of April, 1773, when the marriage ceremony was again performed, but on this occasion in a public manner. On June 28, 1792, Mrs. Sheridan died at Bristol, in the thirty-eighth year of her age. The loss of his wife, we are told by his biographer, was keenly felt by Sheridan. "There was a depth and mellowness in his sorrow which could proceed from habits of affection alone." In the course of four months, however, the deep sorrow of Sheridan had subsided. At the end of November, 1792,

we find Sheridan, after having Madame de Genlis, Mademoiselle d'Orleans, and Pamela for guests at his house at Isleworth for the previous month, proposing marriage to Pamela, and being accepted by her (see Madame de Genlis's *Memoires* and Moore's "Life of Sheridan"), and accompanying his intended and her *gouvernante* to Dover, who were proceeding to Paris, but who were to return to London within a fortnight, when the marriage was to take place. But in the course of a few days, the affianced lady was betrothed to a young nobleman, a friend of Sheridan; and this more advantageous alliance, notwithstanding the new arrangement was in the face of a previous solemn engagement, Madame de Genlis tells us in her Memoirs, she considered "one of the best actions of her life."[1]

The month's enjoyment of the society of Madame de Genlis and her two *elèves,* on the part of Sheridan was followed by an occurrence which seems to be connected with the mysterious incident, which, in all probability, owed its origin to the great inventive faculty of the dramatic mind of Sheridan.

A couple of days before Madame la Gouver-

[1] Sheridan survived this disappointment of his hopes as he had outlived his passionate grief for the loss of his wife a few months previously. We are told by his biographer that "he paid that sort of tribute to the happiness of a first marriage which is implied by the step of entering into a second." In the spring of 1795, he married Miss Ogle, daughter of the Dean of Winchester, being then in his forty-fourth year.

nante took her departure with her *elèves,* from the "hospitable house of Mr. Sheridan," madame tells us in her memoirs it became manifest that Sheridan, "cet homme si celebre par son esprit et ses talens, l'un de plus amiables que j'ai connus," "was passionately in love with Pamela. . . Two days," adds Madame de Genlis, "before we set out, Mr. Sheridan made in my presence his declaration of love to Pamela, who was affected by his agreeable manner and high character, and accepted the offer of his hand with pleasure. In consequence of this, it was settled that he was to marry her on our return to France, which was expected to take place in a fortnight." Moore deems it advantageous to the subject of his biography to doubt, not the fact, be it observed, of the declaration of love and offer of marriage of Sheridan to Pamela, four months after his wife's death, but the sincerity of the declaration and the *bona fide* intention of the gay widower to carry out his proposal. "I suspect this," says Moore, "to be but a continuation of the 'Romance of Dartford.'"

It is hardly necessary to make any comment on the effect that Madame de Genlis's statement cannot fail to make on the minds of all right-thinking persons, respecting her assent to the acceptance of Lord Edward Fitzgerald for Pamela, certainly within the period of a week

from the time of sanctioning Sheridan's proposal for her, her conduct in regard to the marriage of the betrothed girl to the young Irish nobleman, whom she had casually met at a theatre in Paris for the first time, and by whom she must have been proposed for the same night, for on the following day they set out for Tournay, and were joined at the first post by the accepted lover, Lord Edward Fitzgerald.

Two days, says de Genlis, before her departure from Sheridan's house, the proposal of Sheridan for Pamela was made and accepted. When they parted at Dover, Madame says: "*Je me separai avec attendrissement de M. Sheridan qui lui même versa des larmes en nous quittant.*" Moore might regard the *larmes d'attendrissement* merely as dramatic tears, but I think there is evidence in them of the very strong feelings of a gentleman—*passionnement amoureux;* and I have very little doubt on my mind but that Sheridan's proposal of marriage was made in downright earnestness, and was so accepted by Pamela and sanctioned by Madame de Genlis. And with such an impression on my mind, I cannot help thinking Madame de Genlis's conduct in this matter, causing her young *elève,* her unacknowledged daughter, to violate a solemn engagement entered into so very recently as this had been, was unprincipled and disgusting.

The first mention of the name of Lord Ed-

ward Fitzgerald in connection with that of Pamela, in the Memoirs of the Countess de Genlis, is in these terms, under date October, 1792, referring to her sojourn at the house of Mr. Sheridan, at Isleworth:

> Mr. Sheridan was naturally amiable, was particularly kind to us; having fallen desperately in love with Pamela, and being a widower, he was most anxious to marry her. His wife, who had died young, was one of the handsomest and most charming women in England, and Pamela was strikingly like her. Mrs. Sheridan had lived very happily with her husband till she became acquainted with Lord Edward Fitzgerald, who fell violently in love with her, which sentiment she fully reciprocated. The remorse which she felt brought her to the grave."—(*Memoires de Madame la Comtesse de Genlis,* tome iv., p. 106, Paris, 1825.)

Madame de Genlis's foul slander on the character of Sheridan's first wife is quite in keeping with the habitual malevolence of that unprincipled woman.

There is no truth in the statement of the separation of Mr. and Mrs. Sheridan, and the cause assigned for the death of Mrs. Sheridan. Mrs. Sheridan was assiduously attended during her last illness by her husband. She had had much cause for complaint at various times, of neglect and estranged affections on the part of her husband, and Sheridan played the part of a jealous

lover and an injured husband on such occasions when he found his beautiful wife the object of admiration in society, and probably affecting to court it, to let her neglectful husband's coldness and indifference feel the only rebuke he was then capable of feeling. On this subject Moore, in his "Life of Sheridan," says:—

To say that with all this she was not happy, nor escaped the censure of the world, is but to assign to her that share of shadow without which nothing bright ever existed on this Earth. United not only by marriage but by love to a man who was the object of universal admiration, and whose vanity and passions too often led him to yield to the temptations by which he was surrounded, it was but natural that, in the consciousness of her own power to charm, she should be now and then piqued into an appearance of retaliation, and seem to listen with complacence to some of those numerous worshippers who crowd around such beautiful and unguarded shrines. Not that she was at any time unwatched by Sheridan; on the contrary, he followed her with a lover's eyes throughout; and it was believed of both, by those who knew them best, that even when they seemed most attracted by other objects, they would willingly, had they consulted the real wishes of their hearts, have given up every one in the world for each other. So wantonly do those who have happiness in their grasp trifle with that rare and delicate treasure, till, like the careless hand playing with a rose,

In swinging it rudely, too rudely, alas!
They snap it—it falls to the ground.

Moore, in a note to his "Memoirs of the Life of Sheridan," says:

Lord Edward was the only one, among the numerous suitors of Mrs. Sheridan, to whom she is supposed to have listened with anything like a return of feeling; and that there should be mutual admiration between two such noble specimens of human nature, it is easy, without injury to either of them, to believe.

Some months before her death, when Sheridan had been describing to her and Lord Edward a beautiful French girl whom he had lately seen, and added that she put him strongly in mind of what his own wife had been in the bloom of her youth and beauty, Mrs. Sheridan turned to Lord Edward, and said, with a melancholy smile, "I should like you, when I am dead, to marry that girl." This was Pamela, whom Sheridan had just seen during his visit of a few hours to M. de Genlis, at Bury, in Suffolk, and whom Lord Edward married about a year after."

During the sojourn of Madame de Genlis in England, while on a visit to Sheridan's house at Isleworth, Lord Edward Fitzgerald was afforded more than once an opportunity of seeing Madame de Genlis, as we are informed by Moore (vol. i., p. 177), but he did not avail him-

self of it, having a horror of learned ladies: but Lord Edward had no horror of pretty women; and it appears he had heard a great deal of the beauty and accomplishments of Pamela, the young *elève* of the formidable learned lady. Moore states, "He had never, till the time of his present visit to Paris, seen her." And the first time he beheld her, Moore adds, "was in a *loge grillèe* in one of the theatres in Paris." It is quite clear from Madame de Genlis's account of the marriage of Lord Edward with Pamela that their first meeting was in Paris.

But to return to Madame de Genlis's account of the accepted proposal of Sheridan for Pamela:—

> The evening previous to our departure for Dover (continues Madame) Mr. Sheridan, in my presence, made a formal declaration of his love for Pamela, and she, knowing well his high reputation and amiable character, accepted willingly the offer of his hand, and we decided that the marriage should take place upon our return from France, which would be in about a fortnight. I returned to London, with the intention of setting out the following day, and finally we took our departure, with the intention of returning to France, the 20th of October, 1792.

Madame de Genlis and her two *elèves* set out for Paris, accompanied as far as Dover by Mr. Sheridan. But the young nobleman, Lord Ed-

ward Fitzgerald, who, if the preceding statements are to be relied on, had an unhappy influence on Sheridan's domestic happiness, was destined to come into contact with his hopes and prospects of felicity in a new relation to them, and to become the husband, in a few days, of the young lady whom he considered engaged to him. Lord Edward was then residing in the French metropolis. Madame de Genlis had evidently been making inquiries into Sheridan's circumstances, for she states that he was a good deal embarrassed; and when we find the young Irish lord, a little later, had made Pamela's acquaintance in Paris, and that such extraordinary despatch had marked each successive step of the acquaintance,—the courtship, the legalizing of *actes* and the wedding,—we are in a better position to estimate Madame de Genlis's conduct in this business. Poor Sheridan, at parting with the ladies at Dover, shed tears, and Madame de Genlis "separated from him *avec attendrissement.*"

Immediately after Madame de Genlis's return to Paris from England, the Revolution being then at its height, the countess was ordered by the Duke of Orleans to conduct his daughter to Flanders, as we are informed in that lady's Memoirs:—"That same evening," says the countess, "M. de Sillery, to dissipate our wearied spirits, took us to the theatre to a private box

of his own. They performed "Lodoiska." An Englishman, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, was at this play; he of whom I have already spoken, and who was so enamoured of Mrs. Sheridan. The resemblance of Pamela to the person whose death he so bitterly regretted, struck him so forcibly, that he became passionately in love with Pamela; he caused himself to be introduced to our box by an Englishman of our acquaintance, Mr. Stone.[1] The next morning we went to Raincy: it was decided that we should take our departure the following day for Tournay."

The following day they set out for Flanders: "We found," says Madame de Genlis, "Lord Edward, whose love for Pamela had been the cause of his following us to Tournay. No sooner had we arrived at Tournay, than he demanded of me Pamela in marriage. I showed him the papers which furnished proof of her birth and parentage—*qui constataient sa naissance.*"

Referring to the papers previously alluded to, which certified the date and place of birth and parentage of Pamela, Madame de Genlis continues:—

When I showed these papers to Lord Edward, I told him that, having given in my resignation as governess

[1] In a note of Madame de Genlis, she states that her daughter, Madame de Valence, to whom she had given all her papers in charge, had confided them to the care of Mr. Stone, who afterwards said that they had been stolen from him.—R. R. M.

to Mademoiselle, I had a right on retiring from the situation to a pension of six thousand francs which was attached to this place, and that I intended writing to the Duke of Orleans, to beg that I might be permitted to renounce the pension for myself, and to pray that it might be given over to Pamela, who had on her own account a right to this favour, as having been the companion of the infancy and youthful days of Mademoiselle, as well as in consideration of Pamela's proficiency in the English language, which had been useful to the princess's education. Moreover, I felt a great satisfaction, after all the annoyances I had been subject to, in ridding myself of the pension, and in the recollection that I had educated gratuitously Mademoiselle's three brothers. I also told Lord Edward that nothing could make me give him the hand of Pamela in opposition to the wishes of his family, without the written consent of his mother the Duchess of Leinster; upon which he assured me he would obtain it. He set out immediately for England, and returned in a few days, bringing me a most charming letter from his mother the duchess, who gave her consent willingly to the marriage.

The day after his return, the contract was signed, the marriage was solemnized on the spot, and the newly-married couple took their departure the following day for England. This separation made me weep bitterly, although I felt inexpressible joy in insuring in so honourable a manner the future welfare of a child who was so dear to me.

She was thus both my pupil and my god-child; for as I knew that Christ Church was full of Anabaptists,

I was fearful that she might not have been baptized, and I had her baptized conditionally; in consequence of which I went to the bishop to tell him my fears and my intentions. He replied, that they could not act lightly in baptizing conditionally; but that he would at once send on so especial a case one of his secretaries to England; and that if I would confide to him all my papers relating to this child, the secretary would make the necessary inquiries, and on his return I should have an answer. I then gave him over all the papers, and the necessary informations being taken by the secretary, the bishop gave permission for conditional baptism. And it was thus that I became her godmother.

I made a search in Tournay, in October, 1857, for the papers referred to by Madame de Genlis, but found that no episcopal or ecclesiastical archives existed of the date referred to. In the subsequent time of the Revolution, and the alternate occupations of Tournay by German and French armies, all such papers had disappeared. Thinking such documents might exist in the hands of representatives of the bishop referred to by Madame de Genlis, I recently caused new inquiries to be made through my friend M. Vander Maeren Corr, of Brussels, but the search was made without effect. I was more fortunate, however, with respect to another document of not less importance than the preceding.

Previously to the marriage, Madame de Genlis

had Pamela baptized by a Roman Catholic clergyman, for reasons which she assigns in her Memoirs. The account of the baptism is given subsequently to that of the marriage, but no intimation is made that Lord Edward was made acquainted with it.

As Madame de Genlis was a Roman Catholic, her patron, the Duke of Orleans, of the same religion professedly, the Duchess of Orleans practically of it, and her children also, amongst whom Pamela was brought up, it may be concluded that the marriage ceremony would have been performed in a Roman Catholic place of worship, had the exercise of that religion been then tolerated in Tournay, which town had only recently fallen into the power of the French. Of the religious ceremony, however, no account is given by Madame de Genlis's memoirs, or in Lord Edward's biography.[1] Of the official contract entered into by the parties, the particulars will be found in the latter. That document was duly perfected before a government notary of Tournay, signed by Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Pamela (who is described as the daughter of

[1] In a letter to Napoleon, Madame de Genlis, speaking of the Catholic religion being tolerated in England, says:—"They permit (there) as much as people desire, to have their children educated in the Catholic religion; and amongst my elèves I can name two such examples—Lady Edward Fitzgerald, and the child that I brought with me from Berlin."—*Memoires*, tome v., p. 124.

William de Brixey and of Mary Simms),[1] and attested by the following parties, who were present at the execution of the original marriage contract, viz.:—Lieutenant-General Jacques Omoran, F. D., Stephanie Felicitè Ducrest Sillery Brulart (Madame de Genlis), Adele Eugene Egalitè (Mademoiselle d'Orleans), Hermine Compton, Philippe Egalitè (formerly Duc d'Orleans), Pulcherie Valence (Madame de Valence), the daughter of de Genlis; Henriette Sercey (niece of Madame de Genlis); Cæsar Ducrest (brother of M. de Genlis); Louis Philippe d'Egalitè (the future King of the French); Silvestre Mirys; and C. J. Dorez, notary.

It is worthy of observation that Lord Edward is described in the marriage contract as "residing ordinarily in Dublin in Ireland; born at Whitehall, in London."—"*Natif à Whitehall à Londres.*" From this it would appear that London was the birth-place of Lord Edward; a fact (if it be one) with which few people in Ireland are probably acquainted.

[1] In the above mentioned document, executed at Tournay, Pamela is spoken of as "Citizen Caroline Stephanie Simms, aged about 19 years, residing in Paris, known in France under the name of Pamela, a native of Fogo, in the island of Newfoundland, daughter of William de Brixey and of Mary Simms—and on her part the Citizen Stephanie Felicitè Ducrest Brulart Sillery, known in 1786 by the title of the Countess de Genlis—duly authorized to act (on her part) by two depositions made before the Hon. William Lord Mansfield, peer of the realm and Chief Justice of England, both dated the 25th of January, 1786."

The marriage contract, which was signed at Tournay by Lord E. Fitzgerald and Pamela, as cited by Moore, is evidently an incomplete and inaccurately copied document. That circumstance induced me to visit Tournay expressly to have a search made in the archives of the municipality for the certificate of the civil marriage above mentioned, and I am fortunate enough to lay before my readers an exact copy, and one officially authenticated, of that very important document.

Des Registres de l'Etat Civil de la Ville de Tournai, Province de Hainaut, a éte extrait ce qui suit, Paroisse de St. Quentin.

Le vingtsept Décembre, mil sept cent quatre vingt douze, un ban ayant été publié en cette paroisse, ayant obtenu dispense des deux autres de Monseigneur le Prince Salm Salm, évêque de Tournay, du temps clos des Avents et du jour intermédiaire et du domicile, ont été mariés Edward Fitzgerald, natif de Londres, fils de feu Duc de Leinster, agé de vingtneuf ans, et Stephanie Caroline Anne Simms, connue sous le nom de Pamela, agèe de dixneuf ans, native de Londres, fille de Guillaume Berkley et de Marie Simms.[1] Ont assisté

[1] This statement is very important. Madame de Genlis, no doubt, was the person who furnished the particulars of the parties about to be married to the civil authorities of Tournay. It will be observed, Pamela is herein said to be the daughter of a gentleman named William Berkley, whereas M. de Genlis, in her memoirs and other writings, constantly affirms that Pamela was the daughter of a Mr. Seymour.

au dit mariage Philippe Egalitè et Sylvestre Mirys qui ont, ainsi que l'epoux et l'epouse signé conjointment avec nous.

(Etait signé), Edward Fitzgerald, Pamela Simms, L. Philippe Egalitè, Sylvestre Mirys, et M. A. Taffin, curé et doyen de cette paroisse.

Pour extrait conforme: Délivré le quatorze Décembre, 1857.

L'Echevin, Officier délegué de l'Etat Civil. A. Deformanoir.

One of the French journals, immediately after the death of Lady Fitzgerald, in noticing that event, pronounced a very decided opinion of the truth of the alleged relationship of the Duke of Orleans and Madame de Genlis with Lady Fitzgerald. The writer did not feel himself called upon, however, to enter into any particulars in explanation of the mysterious position in which the *elève* of Madame de Genlis, Citoyenne Anne Caroline Stephanie Simms, *alias* Seymour, "connu en France sous le nom de Pamela," stood to the Duke of Orleans, whose son was on the throne of France when that notice was written.

Moore, in the first edition of his biography, in his account of the marriage of Lord Edward with the *elève* of Madame de Genlis, speaks of Pamela in these terms:—"The adopted, or, as it may now be said without scruple, actual daughter of Madame de Genlis by the Duke of Orleans." But in the third edition of his work,

"The Life and Death of Lord Edward Fitzgerald," London, 1832, vol. i., p. 178, he has appended a note to this passage to the following effect:—

> In making this statement, I but followed what has long been the general impression on the subject. Since the first edition of this work, however, I have been honoured with a communication from a source worthy of all credence, in which it is positively denied that any such relationship between Lady Edward and the late Duke of Orleans existed. The duke himself, it appears, in speaking on the subject of his own family, always confirmed the account which Madame de Genlis invariably gave both of the parentage of the young Pamela, and her own adoption of her.

Of the justice of the motive which led Moore to insert the above note in the last edition of his work, there can be no question, but as to the reliability of the statement made to him, there are two considerations which materially affect it. The communication is said to be from a source worthy of all credence. That source should have been named to enable the public to judge of its credibility. If the communication came from the late King of the French (Louis Philippe), we would have to consider the interest he would naturally feel in his father's character, and the motives that interest would suggest in supporting the statement of Madame de Genlis; and, more-

over, if Philippe d'Egalitè was in the habit of speaking at all on the subject in his own family, it could hardly be expected he would contradict the account which Madame de Genlis had given of the English parentage and adoption of Pamela, supposing that statement were false, and taking also into account the position of Madame de Genlis in the family of Philippe d' Egalitè, which, by nearly all contemporaneous writers, was looked on as extremely equivocal.

We would, moreover, have to take into due account the fact, that Moore lay under personal obligations to Louis Philippe, that he was indebted to that prince for a commission for his son in the French army, and must necessarily have been disposed to adopt the views of the Orleans family with respect to the relations of Madame de Genlis with the father of the late King of the French.

Here it is only necessary to state, that Pamela believed she was the daughter of Madame de Genlis, and that her own statement to that effect to my informant, is entitled to more credit than any representation on that subject can be considered made by a member of the Orleans family to the biographer of Lord Edward; and moreover, that the latter acquiesced in the public announcement of his wife being the daughter of the Duke of Orleans, in the notice of his marriage in the London and Dublin periodicals of

the time, and in one especially which was patronized by the Duke of Leinster and another of his brothers—"The Masonic Magazine," for January, 1793—as we find by the list of marriages, at page 96:—

The Hon. Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Knight of the Shire for the Co. Kildare, to Madame Pamela Capet, daughter of his Royal Highness, the ci-devant Duke of Orleans.

CHAPTER XIV

CAREER OF LADY EDWARD

LORD EDWARD FITZGERALD and his young and beautiful bride set out from Tournay for England immediately after their marriage. They arrived in Ireland in January, 1793, and resided there principally during the remaining brief term of Lord Edward's career (of five years and four months), either at Frescati, Leinster House, Dublin, Carton or Castletown, in the county of Kildare. Their domestic happiness during that period seems to have been uninterrupted. Persons who have lived much in their society in that interval assured me they never saw any change in the strong attachment that appeared to subsist between them. Nevertheless, there is good reason to believe the position of Pamela in the female circle of the Leinster family and the little court clique of Dublin fashionable society, was anything but agreeable, and that it would have been intolerable to the poor strange girl newly introduced into it, with all her French peculiarity of idiom, manners, and costume, if it were not for the uniform kindness and generous countenance and protection she experienced on all occasions at the hands of Lady Sarah Napier.

Lady Sarah refers, in a letter to her brother,

the Duke of Richmond, to the report that had reached him that "poor Lady Edward was not popular."

"I own," adds Lady Sarah, "I was struck with the expression, and wondered how you, who could hear nothing of her but through her family, should have heard so (though it is true in Dublin); but I now find from Mary that the very common people have imbibed prejudices against her, poor little soul! to a degree that is quite horrible, yet a well-known characteristic of the English nation."[1]

The supposed relation in which she stood to the Duc d'Orleans, and all the infamy attached to the memory of that man and his sanguinary associates, may partly explain the unpopularity above referred to; but difference of manners, in all probability, had much more to do with it; and it may easily be conceived that a young woman, brought up, as Pamela had been, in Parisian circles, accustomed to display, to constant appearances at private theatricals and concerts, to exhibitions of her talents and peculiar powers of fascination (the latter, in her case especially, were of no ordinary kind), a beautiful *spirituelle* young creature, very conscious of her personal attractions, and as solicitous for admiration as any fair daughter of Eve ever was within the limits of becoming modesty, was not likely

[1] "Life and Death of Lord E. Fitzgerald."

to emerge into the comparative dulness of Dublin and Kildare society, and to buy golden opinions of all sorts of ladies in it.

It would be very unjust to Lady Edward Fitzgerald to form any unfavourable opinion of her attachment to her husband, on account of the silence of his biographer with regard to her during the period of Lord Edward's confinement and the sufferings which terminated his life. We hear nothing of any efforts of hers to gain admission to his dungeon, to attend that sick and dying husband, to take any step whatsoever to minister to him in his extremity, or even to be made acquainted with his state of health from time to time; yet strenuous efforts were made by her to see Lord Edward during his imprisonment, and there is some reason to believe that she did succeed in obtaining one interview with him; and the fact is known to persons in every way entitled to credit, that during Lord Edward's captivity she disposed of the whole of the plate and all of the ornaments of gold and silver in her possession, for the purpose of bribing an under jailor of Newgate, who had been tampered with successfully, as she believed, by an emissary of hers, with the view of effecting the escape of Lord Edward.

I state this on the authority of two ladies still living in Paris, who had been intimately acquainted with Lady Edward in her latter years,

and to whom this statement was made by her. Some confirmation of this statement has recently been given me, which struck me very forcibly. In the month of December, 1857, I visited the cell in Newgate in which Lord Edward died, accompanied by my friend, Dr. Lentaigne, one of the directors of the government convict establishments in Ireland. On inquiry for the official who had been longest employed in the prison, and best acquainted with the former jailors, I was placed in communication with one of the principal warders, a very intelligent person, who tenanted the identical room in which Lord Edward died. This man said that from the time of the death of the under jailor who had been in office at the time Lord Edward died, there was a rumour in the prison, which was believed to be true even to the present time, that "the plate of Lord Edward Fitzgerald was buried within the walls of Newgate:" that an under jailor had listened to proposals which had been made to him by some member of Lord Edward's family, to promote the escape of Lord Edward: that the plate had been taken to him to the jail, had been buried by him, and, having thus secured the reward, he immediately gave information to the authorities of the overtures which had been made to him; and eventually, that he had died suddenly, and the buried plate, etc., remained undiscovered.

It matters little how much of the fabulous may be mixed up with the main fact of a member of the Fitzgerald family having attempted to bribe a jailor of the prison in which Lord Edward was confined, with the view of effecting his escape; that fact remains still an old tradition in the place of his imprisonment, and, associated with the statement of Lady Edward, affords some explanation of the extreme rigour of the authorities in refusing the relatives of Lord Edward access to him in the latter part of his captivity, and some clue also to a passage in a letter of Lord Clare to Lord Henry Fitzgerald, in refusal of an application of the latter for permission to see his brother:—

"If I could explain to you the grounds of this restriction, even you would be hardly induced to condemn it as unnecessarily harsh."

It is not easily to be comprehended why Moore should have suppressed the fact of Lord Clare's interview with Lord Edward Fitzgerald on the occasion of his accompanying Lady Louisa Connolly to the prison where he was confined, a few days before his lordship's death. It is within my knowledge that authentic documentary evidence of that fact was in Moore's possession prior to the publication of his "Life of Lord Edward," and that he declined to avail himself of it. On the occasion of the debate on the attainder bill in the Irish House of Lords, in reference to

some circumstances that had been alluded to relating to the death of Lord Edward, Lord Clare said:—"He well remembered them, for a short time before the death took place, he was witness to one of the most painful and melancholy scenes he had ever experienced." Yet, strange to say, with this confirmation of the documentary evidence above referred to, of which Moore was cognisant, for the passage in Lord Clare's speech is cited by him, he has suppressed all particulars of the interview in question.

There was one piece of baseness which immediately followed Lord Edward's arrest, of so unmanly a character that even Castlereagh, through whose official hands the notification of it was communicated to Lord Edward's family, seems to have been ashamed of having publicity given to it—an order for Lady Fitzgerald's immediate departure from Ireland. No record is to be found in any biographical notice of Lord Edward, of this vile proceeding of banishing the innocent wife of a wounded prisoner in great suffering and imminent danger, who had not been tried, and who was entitled at least to the ordinary privilege of having that wife allowed access to him at such fixed times as the regulations of the jail allowed. At the moment it was issued the wife of Thomas Addis Emmet was sharing her husband's cell.

At the period of Lord Edward's death Lady

Fitzgerald was in her twenty-third year. Her son Edward Fox (born in 1794) was then only four years of age;[1] his daughter Pamela (born in 1795) was a child under three years old;[2] and his other daughter Lucy, an infant (born in 1798), was about six weeks old.[3] The tender age of the infant at the breast, and the weak and delicate state of the mother, rendered still more precarious by all her late anxieties on account of her husband's unhappy fate, entered not into the consideration of Lord Camden and his council, when they issued their order for Lady Edward Fitzgerald's banishment, and insisted on her departure in such lamentable circumstances as hers, and with the charge of three young children to attend to.

Camden's clemency was only impeded in its exercise, we learn, by the evil influence which men of strong minds naturally exerted over his weak understanding.

On her expulsion from Ireland by Lord Camden's government, Lady Edward proceeded to

[1] Edward Fox Fitzgerald, married in 1827 Jane, youngest daughter of Sir John Dean Paul.

[2] Pamela, married, the 21st November, 1823, Major-General Sir Guy Campbell, Bart., widower of Frances Elizabeth, eldest daughter and co-heir of Montague Burgoyne, Esq.

[3] Lucy Louisa, married, the 5th of September, 1825, Captain George Francis Lyon, R. N., the Arctic voyager (who died in 1832). She died in September, 1826, leaving one child.

A writer in the "Court Journal," in November, 1831, states that the two daughters of Lord Edward were reared by the excellent Lady Sophia Fitzgerald.

England, and was kindly received by the Duke of Richmond at Goodwood, where the mother of Lord Edward was then sojourning.

Charity to the dead and the unfortunate who have no defenders, no apologizer for their faults and their imperfections and infirmities, is not less obligatory on biographers, than charity to the great and exalted individuals connected with them, or to the living representatives of those great and exalted persons. Charity to the memory of Lady Edward Fitzgerald demands it should be told, that when her husband died in a prison, when his property was confiscated by the government, when she herself was driven out of the country, and was without a home, a husband, or means of any kind of living in England, no effectual assistance was rendered to her by members of her husband's family, from whom it might have been expected.

When one calls to mind the letters of Lord Edward Fitzgerald to his mother from America, and all the evidence in them of affection of no ordinary tenderness and fondness, that seemed to grow with his growth, and to find new strength in the expression of its devotedness every day that he was separated from her, we naturally expect the repayment of all that love, when he is taken away from her, manifested not only in material feelings of sorrow for the loss of such a son, but in substantial acts of kindness and

generosity in aid and assistance of the young wife and the helpless children he has left unprotected and unprovided for. Such assistance, however, it is painful to find the former did not receive from the dowager Duchess of Leinster. In a letter to Lord Henry Fitzgerald, from Goodwood, dated 17th July, 1798, her grace refers to the unfortunate circumstances in which Lady Edward has been left, and her inability to ameliorate it:—"We are too poor to give her any assistance, and I believe it is pretty much the case with the whole family, who at any other time would have done it with pleasure; but it is now quite out of the question, and therefore to avoid expense must be her first object." Nothing then remained for poor Lady Fitzgerald but, with such slender means as the Duke of Richmond and some other friends of Lord Edward had the generosity to supply her with, and as served for her immediate removal from England and a temporary subsistence in another land, to betake herself to the continent.

Lady Edward, in the latter part of 1798 or beginning of 1799, proceeded to Hamburgh. There Madame de Genlis had been residing some months previously to her arrival, and was then sojourning in Berlin. Lady Edward a few years previously had accompanied Lord Edward to Hamburgh, when he proceeded on his mission with Arthur O'Connor to the French frontier,

to confer with General Hoche. On that occasion Lady Edward had been left at Hamburgh when her husband proceeded on his mission; and those who are curious about the mysteries of state espionage and the spy system of Mr. Pitt, especially in Holland during the war with France, may consult with advantage "The Life and Correspondence of Lord Londonderry," and discover how the movements of Lady Edward at Hamburgh were watched by the agents of Mr. Pitt, how spies and informers were able to report conversations with her and those about her.

On the occasion above referred to Madame de Genlis met her former *elève* and her husband at Hamburgh:—

I again saw, on my journey to Hamburgh, Pamela and her husband, who came for the express purpose of seeing me. I discovered that Lord Edward had very exaggerated ideas on the subject of political liberty and against his government. I suspected that he was embarking in affairs of danger; I spoke about it to Pamela, advising her to exert her influence over him to dissuade him from his purpose. She made a reply which is worthy of being reported: she told me that she had imposed upon herself a law, never to ask him any questions on such affairs, for which she had two reasons: the first was, that she knew in such matters that she would have no power to change his determination; and the second was, that if things turned out badly, and that if she were interrogated by the

authorities, she should always be able to take a Bible oath that she knew nothing about it, and thus that she would not be in the painful alternative either of denouncing him or taking a false oath. I admired this reply, which was so much above her experience and her age.—(*Mem. Madame de Genlis*, vol. iv., p. 274.)

The admiration of Madame at this reply will not be shared by many of the readers of her memoirs.

In 1794 Madame de Genlis, then an exile in Switzerland, complaining of the ingratitude she had met with, consoles herself with the unvarying kindness she had experienced from Pamela, since her marriage as well as previously to it:—

But if the wickedness and ingratitude of some persons afflicted me, I have been consoled by the constant friendship of others very dear to my heart. I have not been surprised at the conduct of Lady Edward Fitzgerald in regard to me. I knew well her angelic disposition, and nothing could add to the high opinion I entertained of her; but her husband has evinced towards Mademoiselle d'Orleans, my niece, and myself all the consideration that might be expected for a mother and sisters who were dear to him. We did not accept any of his generous offers, but the remembrance of them can never be effaced; however, this conduct was inspired by a relative sentiment, which rendered it the more pleasing in my estimation. It assures me of the extent of the active tenderness of Pamela for

the friends of her infancy and for me.—(*Mem. Madame de Genlis*, vol. iv., p. 178.)

It is difficult to imagine circumstances more lamentable, or in which it required a greater amount of strong sound sense and high principle, of religious influence, of prudence and circumspection, than those in which Lady Edward found herself placed in Hamburgh in the year 1799. Her means of subsistence were precarious and limited in the extreme. She had no friends to come to the aid of her youth and inexperience, with their counsel and countenance and example.

After the loss of her husband, this poor lady had experienced, even in England, the heart and hope-chilling effects of cooling regard and declining friendship, and, when she went on the continent, of feeling herself wholly neglected and cast off by her husband's relatives. The only place that Lady Fitzgerald could choose for a fitting place of abode after the death of her husband, was selected by her for an asylum. She prudently fixed on Hamburgh, where the only persons living from whom she had to expect any aid or protection were then residing. Madame de Genlis had recently married her niece there, Henriette de Sercey, the companion of Pamela's early years and the Princess Adelaide's, to M. Mathiessen, a rich banker of Hamburgh. The General Count Valence, who had married a

daughter of Madame de Genlis, was also residing in the environs of Hamburgh with his lady (another fellow *elève* of Pamela's), on a farm which he turned to a profitable account, and where Madame de Genlis had fixed her head-quarters, and had written several of her works. In the unhappy circumstances in which Pamela found herself placed in Hamburgh, she forgot her husband's memory, and formed an unhappy alliance with an American gentleman, who filled the office of consul for some time in Hamburgh, of the name of Pitcairn, with one "not the twentieth part the tithe of her precedent lord."[1]

The following extracts throw some light on the relations that had been kept up by Lady Edward Fitzgerald and Madame de Genlis, subsequently to the first marriage of the former.

In the fifth volume of the *Memoires of Madame de Genlis,* there is a reference to Pamela, which applies to a period of Madame de Genlis's residence at Berlin, in the early part of the year 1801:—

> Hearing at this time that Pamela was at Hamburgh, not choosing to remain in Ireland since the unhappy death of her husband, I wrote to beg her to come and

[1] In the year 1820 I saw Pamela at Toulouse, where she was then living (having resumed the name of Fitzgerald) apart from her second husband, in a very retired manner, and it seemed under restricted circumstances. By her second marriage she had a daughter, who was married in New York, and living there at the period of my first visit to that city in 1835.—R. R. M.

take up her abode with me at Berlin. The heroic manner with which she had conducted herself in the unfortunate affair of her husband, and the purity of her life during the five years of her marriage, had, if possible, augmented my friendship for her. Her reply gave me great pain—she refused positively to come to me. I was not at all prepared for such a result; this intelligence afflicted me greatly. In redoubling my occupations, I endeavoured to divert my mind from the grief it occasioned me, and I did so effectually.—(*Mem. Madame de Genlis*, vol. v., p. 47.)

Madame de Genlis (who seldom gives a date in any relation of events, however momentous) states, in the fifth volume of her "*Memoires*," her return to Paris from exile by the permission of the first consul (Napoleon was declared first consul the 13th of December, 1800, and emperor the 2nd of May, 1804), and her meeting with Pamela at Hamburgh:—

I remained some days (at Hamburgh), and at length took my departure for France. My niece, Pamela, and some other persons came with me as far as Harbourg, where we parted.—(*Memoires*, vol. v., p. 66.)

When Madame de Genlis was living in Paris, pensioned by the Emperor Napoleon, and having a state residence assigned to her in the Arsenal, sometime subsequently to the year 1804, she refers to Pamela in the following remarkable

passage, in connection with an account of a journey of a Berlin protégé of hers named Casimir, from London to Paris:—

On his way back to France, Casimir found Pamela at Dover, who was stopping at the hotel he went to. Casimir was with the Prince Esterhazy, who was bringing him to France in a mail-boat hired expressly for him. The evening of his arrival at Dover, Pamela sent to beg Casimir to go to her; he went, and found her bathed in tears. She told him that she was pursued by creditors, who would arrest her and compel her to return to London, where she would be recognized by other creditors and involved in frightful embarrassments; but that she could be rid of these dreadful fears and pressing misfortunes, if he would on the spot pay for her fifty *louis*, French money, and if he would enable her secretly, in the night, to get on board the vessel of the Prince Esterhazy. Casimir at once handed over to the creditors fifty *louis;* he obtained, with a great deal of trouble, the permission she desired, and he conducted her himself, in the middle of the night, on board the packet, where he hid her in the hold of the vessel, as she was in mortal fear of being overtaken by new creditors.

Casimir came post haste from Calais to Paris, to apprise me of the arrival of Pamela, to whom I had written to conjure her not to return to Paris, but to go back to Hamburgh with her husband, Mr. Pitcairn; reminding her that she had a daughter who was with him, and who had a right to her care. Notwithstanding all my exhortations, she came; *raisons d'in-*

terets, plausible enough, decided her in taking this step. Casimir begged me as a favour to receive her into the Arsenal, and to give her his room, saying that he would be satisfied to sleep in the sitting-room on a stretcher bed. I made her an offer to do so, that is, to lodge her, her daughter, the interesting Pamela, daughter of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, and a young lady, her companion, and to support them. I added only one condition to these proposals, which was, that she should see no persons except those of my acquaintance. She refused all these offers. I then used every effort to persuade her to take a small lodging near me at the Palais Royale, telling her the lodgings were very pleasant and very reasonable; that she could easily walk every day from them and dine with me, and in that way her expenses would be very little. She refused likewise this offer.—*Mem. Madame de Genlis*, vol. v., pp. 223-4-5.)

Pamela, it appears, and Madame de Genlis were never on the same terms of mother-and-daughter-like affection that had subsisted between them up to the period of Lord Edward's death and Pamela's return to France. We find by the next reference to her in the "*Memoirs*," that she had quitted Paris at a later period without apprising Madame de Genlis of her intended departure or taking leave of her:

Pamela came to Paris; she wrote to me, on her arrival, a very affectionate and touching letter, asking permission to come and see me; I replied that she had

decidedly acted wrong in leaving Paris without bidding me adieu, and in not having written to me since; but that, were I ever to shut my door against her, I was sure that the door would open of its own accord at the sight of her; she came frequently to see me. Some little friendly explanations took place, which were sweet when they proceeded from her mouth; she is so amiable, she has so much natural goodness of heart and so much *esprit*, that it is impossible to preserve for any length of time any angry feelings towards her. It required all the revolutions of nations, to make her at times somewhat different in character to that which her infancy and youthful days gave promise of.—(*Mem. Madame de Genlis*, tome vi., p. 171.)

We find an interesting and characteristic anecdote of Pamela relating to the period of her residence in Paris, several years subsequently to her separation from Mr. Pitcairn, in the work of Tournois, entitled "*Histoire de Louis Philippe Joseph Duc d' Orleans*"—

Pamela Seymour was married very shortly after their arrival at Tournay. She espoused Lord Edward Fitzgerald, son of the Duke of Leinster, first peer of Ireland, and of a noble lady of the illustrious house of Richmond. This young person was of a rare beauty, it is said, but born in a very obscure position. An orphan from her cradle, the Duc d'Orleans had her brought from London for the purpose of having her educated with the Princess Adelaide, and M. de Gen-

lis evinced for her an affection almost maternal, which was carried so far that one might well nigh have been deceived as to the nature of the sentiment by which it was inspired. When her marriage was decided upon after her return from England, it was necessary to name a guardian for her, as her father and mother were dead, and she was a minor. She herself made choice of one when the question was first mooted in the drawing-room of her adopted mother. The choice she made was of Barère, who had not at that period acquired the terrible celebrity which he did in after years, and who was then only regarded as a literary man and a pleasant companion. . . .

After Lord Edward Fitzgerald's tragical end in 1798, the unhappy widow, being ruined by the confiscation of his property, wandered about the continent with two children, the last remnants of a family so dear to old Ireland. Later she married again, was separated, and re-took that name which she never should have changed, and returned to France to vegetate at Montauban. Hastening to Paris in 1830, she obtained an honourable existence from the munificence of an august person, but the habitual disorder of her mind caused her to fall again into a precarious condition. At this epoch those who had been banished from France having come back to their country, a lady dressed completely in black presented herself at the house of Barère, and had herself announced to the latter as lady's maid to Pamela. When she appeared before Barère, he said to her—"You are in the employment of a person for whom I have always had an esteem: give me some news of her: is she happy?"

"Alas! no," replied the visitant, "she is not happy;" and she added that Lady Fitzgerald often spoke with gratitude of the kindness her guardian had always evinced for her. "I would like very much to see Pamela, that good Pamela," continued Barère, whilst looking at her with a scrutinizing glance; "tell her, madam, that I have carefully preserved her portrait, and that I carried it away with me in my exile." "You have her portrait?" exclaimed the stranger: "oh! sir, let me see it." When the portrait was shown to her, she could no longer restrain the feelings that the sight of that portrait of her early and happy days excited (she was then in her wane, still attractive, but no longer the beautiful sylph-like Pamela of former days). The feelings of the woman found unpremeditated expression in the words—"Ah! mon Dieu! comme jétais jolie!"—"It is you, then, Pamela," said Barère; "you need no longer attempt to conceal yourself." "Yes," replied she; "in my anxiety to see you once more, I determined on this visit, and in the guise in which you see me.—Ah! I am sure you find me much changed; do you not?—Alas! I have suffered much: at some other time I will relate all that to you." Then seizing on the portrait which Barère had been showing to her, she exclaimed with great vivacity, "Give it, give it to me; I want to go immediately and show it to one of my friends." She then went away with tears in her eyes, after having pressed the hand of Barère, who never again saw her; for soon after that interview, she absented herself from Paris, and returned there only to die; her death took place in the month of November, 1831.

CHAPTER XV

DEATH OF LADY EDWARD

THE only living person (with one exception) who could give an account of the close of the career and the death-bed of Lady Edward Fitzgerald is the niece of Madame de Genlis, Madame Georgette Ducrest, now living in Paris by the exercise of her musical talents, and living, I am sorry to say, in very straitened circumstances. That lady had peculiar claims on the consideration of Madame de Genlis. She was the daughter of that brother of the latter who is so eulogised in her memoirs for his talents and for the services he rendered to her illustrious patron, the Duc d' Orleans, the infamous Egalitè, in the high office of Chancellor of the house of Orleans. Yet Madame de Genlis never rendered an effectual service to his widow or his child; and seemed to forget that they were in existence, as she did the existence of her unacknowledged daughter, when she made her will and left whatever she possessed to those who stood in no need of her bounty.

Poor Madame Ducrest in her misfortunes was, however, largely assisted—largely, indeed, considering her means, and that not occasionally

nor for a short time, but for several years—by Pamela subsequently to her return to France from Ireland, and up to the period of that generous creature's death.[1] In the following account of Pamela's last illness and death by Madame Ducrest, the reader will find a narrative in the highest degree interesting, honourable to the person who wrote, and very advantageous to the memory of her of whom it is written:—

Some months after the death of Madame de Genlis, her beloved *elève*, the beautiful Lady Fitzgerald, was taken seriously ill, and from the first moment she had a presentiment of her approaching end. She had come to take up her abode in Paris, and occupied rooms in a furnished hotel until such time as she might find suitable apartments.

Being apprised that she was ill, I hastened to see her, and was much shocked at the change in her appearance. She begged me to send immediately for Dr. Recamier, and requested I would not leave her. I therefore remained, leaving my little *ménage* to my mother. Madame M. and her lady's maid assisted me in nursing her: but her situation becoming more alarming, we called in a sister of charity to aid us in our care. The doctor assured us there was no danger, and

[1] The words of M. Ducrest are given in the original French:—"A la mort de mon père (en 1824) je restai avec une rente viagère fort minime; Paméla voulut contribuer à l'education de mes filles, et me força d'accepter tous les ans trois cents francs destinés à cet usage, qui me furent exactement payés jusqu'a sa mort; cependent elle n'etait pas riche!"—"Mémoires de l'Imperatrice Joséphine," par Georgette Ducrest, p. 27.

thought her complaint would turn to measles. That disease, however, did not show itself, and at the expiration of twenty-one days, Pamela felt so very ill that she asked for a priest. I sent to beg M. l'Abbé de la Madeleine, Vicaire de l'Assomption, to come. Religious, and severe towards himself, and very indulgent towards others, he seemed to me, above all others, the person best calculated to reconcile the soul of my poor friend with its Creator. He came. His zeal, his persuasive eloquence, the simple unction of his exhortations did far more for its peace than we had dared to hope. He inspired our dear invalid with a true joy at quitting this world, where she had suffered so much. She felt the most ardent desire for eternity and for that home that is for all time, wherein she might be in communion with those who had been dear to her in this life. Happy and tranquil from the time she had had an interview with the holy priest, she besought us not to deplore the termination of her sufferings. Whilst admiring the sweet serenity which was spread over her angelic countenance, we might well, indeed, have had reason to rejoice; but the idea of so soon being separated from her drew tears in abundance from us. But when she was in the last extremity, I could not even then believe that all hope was lost. I consulted Sister Ursula. She examined attentively for some time the features of Lady Fitzgerald; at length she calmly said—"At midnight all will be over." It was then six o'clock in the evening. This sentence was pronounced with the most perfect composure. The good sister detailed to us the two or three different crises that would lead to the last one, to which the

eternal rest would succeed. She did not seem to understand our affliction, resignation having for a long time past become to her a thing simple and natural. She appeared to be astonished not to find it reign in all around her.

How can I express what I felt, when, for the first time, I was witness to a scene so solemn and terrible! This dying person, who was resigned and courageous from the moment that she heard the intelligence of her approaching end, which she would be informed of, had always been kind and sincere in all her relations with me; in the most distressing circumstances of my unhappy life she remained always the same towards me, when so many others kept aloof, as if misfortune was contagious.

Not many days before her last illness and death, Lady Fitzgerald was still admired and sought after; brilliant in society, *spirituelle*, and remarkable for a liveliness of fancy and playfulness of imagination displayed in conversation, in a delicate and refined raillery that gave the vivacity of repartee the resemblance at least of wit. In the *salon* of the Comtesse de Balbi, where mediocrity could not gain admittance, Pamela was the life and soul of the society. So many graces and powers of fascination, such goodness and amiability, were soon to be but a remembrance, perhaps, of a single woman who was her friend. Lady Fitzgerald, full of talents and endearing qualities, beautiful as an angel, was lately seen by us, and in a short time again was beheld by us a corpse and a frightful spectacle! Oh! what reflections should not the great change raise up within us, and the remem-

brance that she, who underwent this awful change, had become a model of the most fervent piety, and those who witnessed it remain still to profit by it.

Pamela had for a considerable time been on bad terms with a niece of her husband's, the Comtesse de Chabot.[1] When she found herself very ill, she expressed the greatest desire to see that lady. I undertook to write to her, and Madame de Chabot came during the day. She had a long conversation with Pamela, who told me after she went away that the visit had been of great service to her, as the comtesse had expressed herself very kindly towards her. The following day Madame de Chabot again came to see her; in passing through the *salon,* she took notice of a miniature painting bearing a very strong resemblance to Lord Edward. Madame de Chabot evinced the greatest desire to carry it away, in order to show it to her husband. I did not think it right to refuse her, but I begged her to return it immediately. I never saw it again. I think that the likeness may probably have been sent to Ireland to Lady Campbell, a daughter of Pamela.

Quite absorbed with grief, the time flew quickly away, without my calculating that but a few minutes remained when I should still hear that sweet voice. I was suddenly drawn from this reverie by hearing Sister Ursula begin to recite the prayers for the departing soul. The sufferer even then replied aloud: insensibly her voice became broken and feeble, then unin-

1 Lady Elizabeth Charlotte Fitzgerald, daughter of William, second Duke of Leinster, married, in 1809, Major-General Louis William Viscount de Chabot.

telligible, and at length the words from her lips (still moved in prayer) ceased altogether. Her looks still expressed her lively and confiding faith. Very soon her eyes, which were raised to Heaven, grew dull, her hands grasped convulsively the crucifix which she held, and in a few instants she was no more. We remained stupefied with the irreparable loss, as if we had been struck down by some unexpected blow.

When poor Pamela had returned from Ireland, and fixed herself in France, for many years past she occupied a pretty small country house near Montaubon, and diffused innumerable benefits around her. Her name will for ever be held in grateful remembrance in the cottages of the poor in the vicinity of her place of residence. People of fashion will remember, perhaps, the fascinations of the beautiful Lady Fitzgerald; the poor will never forget the kind and generous acts of Pamela. During the illness of Lady Fitzgerald, a man advanced in years called every day to make inquiries about her state. As he seemed very desirous every time he came to know all particulars about her, he always asked to see me, for I had taken up my abode in her house, in order to be the better enabled to nurse her. This man had a kind expression of countenance and a gentle voice. Not knowing who he was, on one occasion I asked him his name, which he refused to tell me. I spoke of him to Pamela, but she could not enlighten me on the subject; she could not even imagine who it could be. The day after her death this same gentleman came, and upon hearing the sad news, he burst into tears. "Madame," he said, "when you know who I am, and speak to people

about me, you will hear, no doubt, a great deal that is bad of me. You may tell them who speak of me that you know I have feeling at least to shed tears for the death of an old friend who had chosen me for her guardian. My name, Madame, is Barère." He then hurried away.

Charged with the painful duty of giving orders in regard to the interment of Lady Fitzgerald, I was greatly embarrassed; for when I opened her desk in presence of the friend who had, together with myself and her lady's maid, attended her during her illness, to find in it only one hundred francs. Not being in a position, under these circumstances, to do what my heart dictated, I made an appeal to one of the members of the Fitzgerald family who was in Paris. That person refused even to be present at the funeral, alleging that Pamela having married a second time, all acquaintance with her had ceased, and that person would know nothing further about her.

Not knowing what to do, I wrote to Madame Adelaide, and gave her these sad details. The princess immediately replied to me that she would take upon herself all the expenses of the burial of her old companion. She gave order that it should be handsome, without superfluities.

As well as I now recollect, that ceremony cost about 700 francs, which the princess paid. The Orleans family allowed Pamela a pension of 4,000 francs a year, and that, together with her slender dowry, which had only been paid her since her son had been reinstated in his father's property, constituted all her fortune.

I sent for the commissary of police, to take an inventory of the effects of Lady Fitzgerald; they were of very little value, and were put into several trunks, of which they gave me the care after having placed their seal on them. Being obliged to go away, to begin anew my artistic career, the effects were remitted to the care of the commissary of police, who was bound to take care of them till the time should have expired which is allowed by the law for the heirs who are absent to claim them. I do not know whether they have since then been sold for the benefit of the government.

I informed Lady Campbell, the daughter of Pamela, who resided in Ireland, of her death, as also Mr. Pitcairn, who was in New York. The former wrote me several letters, expressive of feelings of regret. Mr. Pitcairn behaved exceedingly well upon the occasion. Having learnt from me that Pamela had left some debts, he sent money to pay the greater part of them, and thanked me in the kindest manner for all my care of her.

I have dwelt upon these details, as Lady Fitzgerald's connection with the leading man of the attempted revolution in Ireland thus became a person of historic note.[1]

In the month of October, 1857, I made a special visit to the gallery at Versailles, for the purpose of seeing the picture of Pamela. It exists in the Salle Attique, No. 167; the number

[1] "Chroniques Populaires, Memoires sur l'Imperatrice Josephine. Par Georgette Ducrest." Barba Imprim. Page 27.

of the picture in the catalogue is 4,438. It is thus described: "La Leçon de Harpe, par Mauzaisse d'après Giroust.—H. 2, 47—L. 1, 83.

"Mademoiselle d'Orleans (Eugène-Adelaide-Louis, fille de Louis-Philippe-Joseph, Duc d' Orleans), reçoit un leçon de harpe de Madame de Genlis la gouvernante; Mademoiselle Pamela, depuis Lady Edward Fitzgerald, tourne les feuillets du cahier de musique. Le tableau original print en 1787, par Antoine Giroust, faisait partie de la galerie du Palais-Royal."

The above description of the position of the three figures is perfectly accurate. It is to be presumed that the picture in the Versailles gallery is an exact copy of an original by Giroust. But the latter may have treated the same subject in a second picture, varying the position of Pamela from that in the first, and it would seem very probable that such was the case; for one "Leçon de la Harpe" had certainly been in the Orleans collection, and a similar picture in the possession of Madame de Genlis.

Be that as it may, the representation of Pamela in the picture in the Versailles gallery gives an idea of such exquisite beauty, surpassing *eclât* of radiant loveliness, joyous vivacity of face and form all instinct with spirit life, such angelic sweetness of expression, and sylph-like grace, and aerial lightness, as we may look for in vain in all the portraits of the court beauties of all

the Bourbons, in that great galaxy of renowned loveliness in the gallery of Versailles. In this portrait of Pamela we find—

> All that painting can express,
> Or youthful poets fancy when they love."

There is something in the freshness of that charming face, in the purity and innocency and simplicity that breathes in every feature of this girl of thirteen, the utter absence of everything worldly, false, and factitious, calculated to remind one that she was the *elève* of Madame de Genlis, that makes one feel a kind of melancholy pleasure in gazing on it, after confronting the glare of the bright eyes of the innumerable Pompadours, la Vallieres, Dubarrys, and other gorgeous divinities of that Pantheon of all the goddesses of the French court staring out of the canvas into the faces of their beholders, and boldly challenging admiration.

The late James Roche, of Cork, the well-known contributor for many years to the "Gentleman's Magazine" and other English periodicals, in a remarkable work, printed, but not published, in 1850, entitled "Essays by an Octogenarian," states that he witnessed the funeral procession on the occasion of the interment of the remains of Lady Fitzgerald, but does not recollect whether it was attended or not by the royal carriages, as he had seen had been the case

at the obsequies of Madame de Genlis six months before. All the expenses, however, he states, were defrayed by the king. Roche states that Lady Fitzgerald was born in 1776 or 1777. In the legal document—cited by Moore—the marriage contract formally perfected and signed before the authorities in December, 1792, she is described as being about nineteen years of age—"*environ dix neuf ans.*" If she was then nineteen, she must have been born in 1773, and consequently was ten years younger than Lord Edward, and not fifteen, as Roche states. But I have already entered sufficiently into this subject, and shown that Pamela was born in 1776, and that Roche, though greatly mistaken in many matters relating to Pamela, in his statement respecting her age was not far from the truth. In the "Gentleman's Magazine" for November, 1842, p. 487, and the republished "Essays by an Octogenarian," 1850, vol. ii., p. 547, Mr. Roche endeavours to prove that Madame de Genlis was not the mother of Lady Edward Fitzgerald:—

> The question tried before Lord Mansfield, and very distinctly reported by the reputed mother in her memoirs, would prove that Pamela was born of English parents, and named Syms, but engaged when very young by Madame de Genlis, as a companion to the duke's children, in order to accustom them to speak

English, as, with a similar view, they had Italian and German attendants, for the acquisition of other languages. To this material evidence we may add the moral incredibility that the virtuous and most excellent duchess could have entrusted their education to the charge of a double adulteress, the defiler of her own bed; and my firm conviction, supported by other sources of knowledge, with which I forbear incumbering the subject is, that the impeachment is destitute of truth, while I am aware that it has obtained general credit.

The eventual fortunes of Lady Edward may not be so generally known.

After Lord Edward's death, Lady Fitzgerald retired to Hamburgh, where she married Mr. Pitcairn, an American gentleman, from whom she was subsequently divorced, and in 1812 repaired to Paris, whence she proceeded, for the benefit of a kindlier climate, to Montaubon. While in the rural environs she adopted the garb and assumed the crook of a shepherdess, in imitation of one of the tales of Marmontel, "*La Bergere des Alpes;*" but this wayward fancy yielded to the stirring movement of the late revolution, the glorious days of 1830, when she returned to the capital and there died, at the Hotel du Danube, Rue de La Sourdiere, in November of the following year.

It will be observed, Mr. Roche, in the interval between 1812 and 1830, has but a single passage to refer to in the life of this poor lady, and would seem desirous to leave the impression that for a period of eighteen years, this lady indulged in

the folly of assuming the costume of a shepherdess. Now, to my certain knowledge, no such ridiculous costume was worn by her in 1820, when I visited Montaubon; nor did any of the English residents there, who were well acquainted with the lady, ever make mention of the absurd mode of dressing ascribed to her by Mr. Roche. The probability is, that she may have appeared in some fancy ball in the costume of "*La Bergere des Alpes,*" and the adoption of it on one occasion may have furnished material for the invention of the customary costume.

Roche would have it understood that Pamela had not sojourned in Paris in the interval between 1812 and 1830. But she frequently in that interval was sojourning in Paris, I am informed by her intimate friend, Madame La Baronesse d'E——.

We find in the *Memoires of Madame de Genlis,* an account of Pamela residing in Paris in 1814. Madame de Genlis was then residing in the Rue de Vaugirard, and Pamela in the Abbaye aux Bois:—

"Pamela had retired to the Abbaye aux Bois, '*parti decent et convenable,*' that I had not only approved but counselled."

Roche has fallen into a multiplicity of errors respecting Pamela. It is not true that the death of Madame de Genlis preceded that of Pamela only six months. There was an interval of nearly

eleven months between their deaths. Louis Philippe did not bear the expenses of Pamela's funeral; they were borne by the Princess Adelaide. It is not true that Pamela assumed the costume of a shepherdess as her ordinary attire at any period of her sojourn in the south of France. Her remains were not carried to the church of St. Roch, and no funeral service was performed there over her remains. She did not die in the parish of St. Roch, nor in the Rue de la Sourdiere, as Roche states, but in the adjoining parish of the church of the Oratoire, and at No. 7 in the Rue de Richepanse, at the Hotel de Danube still existing in that street, now numbered No. 11. Nor is it true that "she died absolutely penniless, though her income amounted to £500 a-year," as Roche asserts. And, lastly, I may observe, that Roche had no means of knowing anything concerning the parentage of Pamela, except through Madame de Genlis and the *entourage* of Louis Philippe and the Orleans family. He had no acquaintance with Pamela, nor with any one in France who was intimately acquainted with her. His opinion, therefore, on the subject of Pamela's obscure English origin and of her mode of life in France is of no value.

The following official record of the decease of Lady Fitzgerald, which I obtained at the mairie of the 1er arrondissement de Paris, settles beyond dispute the time and place of her death.

PREFECTURE DU DEPARTEMENT DE LA SEINE.

Extrait du Registre des actes de Decès de l'année 1831.
1*er arrondissement.*

Du huit Novembre mille huit cent trente un, à trois heures du soir.

Acte de dècès de dame Anne Caroline Stephanie Symes, rentière agée de cinquante sept ans, veuve en premier noces de Sieur Edouard Fitzgerald, et mariée en seconde noces à Sieur Joseph Pitcairn. La dite defuncte nèe à la nouvelle Angleterre, et décédée à Paris, Rue Richepanse, No. 7, aujourd'hui à midi dix minutes.

Constaté par nous Charles Gabillot Chevalier de la Légion d'honneur, adjoint au maire du premier arrondissement de Paris, sur la déclaration des Sieur Jean Marie Guedon tenant hotel garni, agé de soixante deux ans, demeurant Rue Richepanse, No. 7; Jean Louis Simon, carrossier, agé de trent cinq ans, demeurant Rue Duphot, No. 24, lesquel sont signé avec nous apres lecture faite y signé:

GUEDON-SIMON-GABILLOT.

Pour copie conforme. Paris le 10 Novembre, 1857.
Le Maire, A. GRONVILLE.

It will be observed that Pamela's age is stated fifty-seven years, which would make the year of her birth 1774. This record, however, is evidently founded on information furnished by Madame Ducrest, based on statements of Pamela's age, which I have already shown were

incorrect. She was born in the year 1776, and died the 8th of November, 1831, aged fifty-five years.

In the bureau of the cemetery of Montmartre, in November, 1857, after a long and fruitless search in the register for a record of the burial of Lady Edward Fitzgerald, I searched the books *de novo* for an entry of a burial under the name of Symes, and was successful.

The following entry exists in the register:—"8th November, 1831; Caroline Anne Stephanie, Dame Symes—femme Pitcairn;" and then follows an indication of the locality of the grave, and a notification of the ground having been acquired in perpetuity by purchase—"*par concession en perpetuite.*"

Not one of the guardians of the cemetery, however, could discover any traces of a tomb bearing the name of Pamela; and yet it was known that a tomb did once exist in the cemetery bearing that name. At length, after a wearisome examination of some hundreds of tombstones, one of the officials appeared, who pointed out the precise spot where the tomb ought to be. The spot pointed out was an enclosed space on the left-hand side of a terrace that is approached by the avenue immediately fronting the entrance to the cemetery. On the opposite side of this enclosed space is the well-known tomb of Armand Marast, the President of the Chamber of Depu-

ties in 1848, one of the notabilities of that stormy period with whom I had been intimately acquainted. No other sepulchral landmark henceforth will be required to find the spot which it cost me such trouble to discover. The surrounding iron railing of this place of burial appeared to have sunk into the earth about two feet. Six-and-twenty years are a long time, conservators of French cemeteries think, for the existence even in ruin of a neglected and forgotten grave. The soil here had accumulated above the adjoining tombs, which were of a later date; and within the railing of the intermediate one, four cypress trees (one at each corner) had grown so luxuriantly, that no appearance of a tombstone could be discovered. A closer examination, however, on pressing back the boughs of the trees, led to the discovery of the long-sought tombstone, but in a very ruinous condition, having sunk, like the iron railing, far below the level of the adjoining graves. This headstone had a slab of white marble inserted in it about the centre, on which are inscribed the following words:—

A Pamela
Lady Edward Fitzgerald
Par
Son Ami Le Plus Devoué
L. L.

I sent for a mason connected with the cemetery, and had an estimate prepared of the ex-

pense of raising the headstone to its original height, deepening the letters of the inscription, setting up the iron railing on a new foundation of masonry, and otherwise thoroughly repairing and embellishing the tomb; and in the course of a week from that time I had the satisfaction of seeing the tomb of Pamela, which had so completely fallen into decay, restored and rendered as fresh looking as any of the adjacent tombs.[1]

Louis Laval, Duc de la Force, whose initials are to be found in the brief inscription on the tombstone above mentioned, could not be under sixty-eight or seventy years of age at the time of

[1] In the progress of the many troublesome inquiries I instituted in Paris, in order to ascertain who the parties were who had discharged the last offices of friendship at the death bed, and in the disposal of the remains of Pamela, I had to make a search in the "Bureau des Archives" of the deaths and the burials in the different cemeteries in Paris, for a record of the acquisition of the ground in the cemetery of Montmartre; and from the chef de bureau I obtained the following extract from the "Listes de Decès de 1831":—

"Concession en perpetuité de terrain le 9 Decembre, 1831—dans le cimitiére du Nord, pour y fonder à perpetuité la sepulture particuliere de la dite Dame Stephanie Symes, veuve en 1er noces de Lord Edouard Fitzgerald, et en 2nd noces, femme de M. Pitcairn, decedée à Paris Rue Richepanse No. 7—le 8 Novembre, 1831.

"Concession faite à Madame la Comtesse Valence, demeurant à Paris, Rue Richepanse, No. 7, au nom des heritiers au Madame veuve Pitcairn."

The fact is, no concession can be acquired except in the name of the heirs or representatives of the deceased; and in the present instance it is clear Madame de Valence was not acting for Mr. Pitcairn, but for her friend and connection by marriage, M. le Duc de la Force.—R. R. M.

the death of Pamela. At the commencement of the Revolution he was old enough to figure among the partisans of Louis XVI. He joined the emigrant princes and distinguished himself in the *armée de Conde* by his valour on several occasions. He enjoyed the special confidence of Monsieur (subsequently Louis XVIII), *son auguste parrain,* while the royalists were able to maintain the struggle on the frontiers.

In 1800, when there was no hope for their cause, he reëntered France and lived in retirement on his property at Montaubon, up to 1809, when he was nominated a deputy of the department of Tarne et Garonne. He again entered the military service and distinguished himself highly at the battles of Essling (where he was decorated), of Wagram, and of Moscow. At the latter he was wounded and had two horses killed under him, and obtained the cross of the Legion of Honour. On the occasion of the disastrous retreat from Moscow, he was nominated by the Emperor to a command in the *Battalion Sacré.* At the restoration of the Bourbons he was appointed inspector-general of cavalry, and during *les cent jours* joined the Duc d'Angouleme at Nismes.

When he was about to enter on the duties of commandant civil and military of several of the southern departments, the people and newly raised military force of Cahors rose against the

royalists, and took possession of the town. The Duc de la Force, accompanied solely by his secretary, displaying the white cockade, hoping to bring back the insurgents, entered the town, was taken prisoner, and was on the point of being put to death for refusing to cry *"Vive l'Empereur,"* when his coolness and presence of mind saved him from the most imminent danger. He thrust back some of the bayonets that were pointed at his breast, and said to his assailants *d'une voix calme et forte:* "When you have pronounced these words, *Vive l'Empereur,* as I have done, wounded on the field of battle, you will have a right to dictate the law to me; till then, conscripts, be silent, and do not assassinate an officer in cold blood, who fought for France before you were born." The few right words on the right occasion duly spoken by the old soldier to the young French conscripts, had the desired effect. The duke's life was saved, but he was detained as a prisoner, sent to Paris, and there remained deprived of his liberty till the period of the second restoration. His next appearance on the public stage was in the Chamber of Peers, where he made himself remarkable by the sagacity and moderation of his opinions. In 1820 the chief command of the department of Tarne et Garonne was given to him, and in that appointment he continued long enough to gain the good will of all classes, and especially to secure the

gratitude of the industrious poor for his unceasing efforts to promote their interests and relieve their necessities, and notably on the occasion of the great inundation of the Tarne, in the department of which Montaubon is the chief lieu, in 1825. "Throughout his long and varied career," we are told by the author of the *Memoires de Josephine,* "M. le Duc de la Force has conducted himself so as to preserve the honour of his name, as illustrious as it is ancient, and its celebrity would have commenced with him if his ancestors had not already ennobled it."

So much for the man who claimed the friendship of Pamela and manifested feelings of devotion to her memory.

The close of the career of a woman once celebrated for her beauty, and courted in all circles on account of her varied fascinations of face, form, manner, and accomplishments, in such circumstances as those in which poor Pamela terminated her days, is a mournful subject for meditation, presenting as it does so many striking contrasts and strange vicissitudes, and placing before our minds in so forcible a manner the frailness of that beauty on which so great a price is set, and the worthlessness of the tenure of that admiration, for the duration of which the young and the attractive have so little apprehension. But when the change does come that has not been looked for, and there has been no training

of the intellect, no teaching of the heart, no infusing of religious sentiments into the soul, to cause a proper estimate to be taken of that alteration, it is no wonder that the result should be unfortunate.

Poor Pamela had suffered grievous wrong in the way of bad instruction at the hands of Madame de Genlis. Had she been differently educated—had she been suffered to remain in Ireland after her husband's death—had she been enabled to live there in the society of her departed husband's family—had she been kindly treated, generously aided, counselled and countenanced by them, how different might have been her fate and her career! Surely those who think they have much of error and wayfulness, of levity and capriciousness, to discover and to deal rigorously with in her career, should bear in mind that she, poor thing! at the most critical and trying moment of a woman's life, had great trials to endure, great neglect and coldness on the part of former friends and connections to complain of, great temptations to error to encounter, and that her memory has great claims on the charity of all well thinking people to put forward in its defence.

If the main object of biography was to record heroic virtues, to eulogize prosperity, success, a fortunate position, all the accidental advantages of high birth and station, patronage

and protection, the results of good guidance in early life, and of well-trained habits, or of favourable opportunities of advancement, and the attainment of consideration and popularity, the history of the dead would be of little service to society at large: it would be only useful to pamper the pride of individuals happily circumstanced, and to foster a very prevalent tendency to represent those of whom that life history treats, as perfect beings exempt from all the ordinary failings of humanity. The duty of a biographer is not to ignore the infirmities or frailties that may have existed in any portion of that humanity with which he has to deal, or to exhibit them for any purpose which is not legitimate in its aim, always keeping in view the obligations of charity as well as those of truth, and setting forth all the circumstances which may have had a controlling influence over character and temperament, in all their relations with a chequered career. They who so understand the duties of biography are not likely to be unmindful of the claims to sympathy of those who have suffered grievous calamities and have been exposed to great dangers, who, friendless and forlorn, have been thrown on the wide world, and left there, without guidance or assistance, to pursue a career never deviating from the right road to happiness and peace. It was said in ancient times of one who had set out in early life on that

road, but whose footsteps eventually were not always on it, in the various wanderings and weary roamings and strayings of her life-journey in after years:

"She had no mother to direct her ways."

When we realize in our mind all the meaning of this simple allusion to that want, which no other earthly advantage can supply, when we fill up all the outlines of calamity slightly sketched in these few but significant words which I have cited, it will be time enough to assume a stern aspect, a severe and a harsh tone, and to speak in terms of unmitigated censure and reprehension of similar deviations in similar circumstances. And in the meantime, when we find them referred to the same source, we cannot feel too strongly it is our sympathy that is appealed to, in that reference, for the unfortunate, and our candour that is called on to confess how much we have reason to be thankful for to God, that those we may love most and best in this world have not been tried by misfortunes like her whose unhappy career has been just noticed, have not been exposed to the same dangers, and left to confront them, at the age of five-and-twenty, or even less, as friendless and forsaken as the unfortunate Pamela had been left, at the death of her beloved husband, Lord Edward Fitzgerald.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. WILLIAM JACKSON

THE subject of this memoir, though not born in Ireland, was descended from a highly respectable family of a northern county, of the Newtownards branch of the Jacksons, from which the celebrated American general of that name sprung, I am informed by Mr. John M'Adam of Belfast. From an account of his own, given in the "Northern Star" of the 6th of January, 1794, we learn the following particulars of his family.

Mr. Jackson, shortly to be tried on a charge of high treason, is only accidentally an alien to this country, he being immediately descended from a family of the first respectability in Ireland. He is the youngest of four sons. His father officiated in the Prerogative Court of Dublin. His elder brother was Dr. Richard Jackson, an eminent civilian, vicar-general to the late Archbishop of Cashel, and an intimate friend of the late Dr. Radcliff, and that truly respectable character, Philip Tisdall, attorney-general. The mother of this unfortunate gentleman was a Miss Gore, whose paternal estate was situated near Sligo. The aunt of Mr. Jackson (by the mother's side) was married to Dr. Sall, many years register to the archiepiscopal court of Dublin. Thus respectably descended, it can

General Lake

Leader of the English Forces in Ireland. From an Engraving by P. Lightfoot

hardly be supposed that Mr. Jackson is an enemy to Ireland, while Irish blood only flows through his veins. His political views of things may have been erroneous; and that is all that candour should permit us to say.

In the "Dublin Registers" of the several years from 1761 to 1769, we find the name and office of Dr. Richard Jackson, the elder brother of the unfortunate William Jackson above referred to, in the list of officers in the Consistory Court.—

"Metropolitan Court of Cashel, Vicar-General Richard Jackson, J.U.D., Dublin."

The judge of the Prerogative Court was then the Right Hon. Philip Tisdall. The judge of the Consistory Court, Dr. Radcliff, LL.D. The name of Dr. Jackson disappears from the directories after 1769.

Mr. William Jackson at an early period was established in London. Having received a good education, he turned his talents to some account as a tutor, and eventually received ordination in England. He was attached for some time to Tavistock Chapel, Drury Lane, London, and became a very popular preacher there.

His profession as a Protestant clergyman did not prevent him from engaging in newspaper pursuits and politics. He connected himself with a fashionable journal which had been recently established, and in this journal he advo-

cated the cause of the celebrated Duchess of Kingston, more correctly the Countess of Bristol.

How and at what period his intimacy with her commenced is not known; but that he was wholly in her confidence is certain, and that he was also intimately acquainted and patronized by the Earl of Bristol, the first husband of the duchess.

In a memoir of the life of the Right Hon. John Hervey, Earl of Bristol, published in "The New General Biographical Dictionary," in 8 vols., London, 1795, we are told that the second Earl of Bristol was appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and his brother was to have accompanied him as secretary, but the earl never went over to that kingdom. Jackson likewise was promised a lucrative appointment on the same establishment, but was disappointed in this expectation.

The marriage of Miss Chudleigh, daughter of Colonel Chudleigh, with the Hon. Augustus John Hervey (subsequently Earl of Bristol) was privately solemnized in 1744. The clergyman who solemnized it having died, the parish register having been mutilated, and the only written evidence that existed of the marriage purposely destroyed, the lady successfully instituted certain proceedings in the ecclesiastical courts, separated from her husband, and married secondly the Duke of Kingston in 1769. The duke died in a few years, leaving all his immense prop-

erty to the duchess during her life, on condition of her continuing in a state of widowhood. The duchess betook herself to the continent, and resided a considerable time in Rome, some time in Prussia, and for lengthened periods in Paris and at Calais; and there is reason to believe that Mr. Jackson's first residence in Paris was during the period that the duchess resided there.

In 1775 Mr. Hervey succeeded to his brother's titles, and next year an indictment was preferred against the duchess for bigamy in the House of Lords, when all the peers but one pronounced her guilty. In 1795 her first husband, the Earl of Bristol, died, and was succeeded by his eccentric brother, the celebrated Bishop of Derry.

A small volume in 12mo, entitled "The Life and Memoirs of Elizabeth Chudleigh, afterwards Mrs. Hervey and Countess of Bristol, commonly called Duchess of Kingston," was published in Dublin in 1789, less than two years after the death of the duchess—evidently written by one closely acquainted with the private life of that lady (in a pretentious, flippant, pedantic style, and with many scriptural citations), very probably by the Rev. William Jackson, he being at that time greatly disappointed at being left wholly unnoticed in the will of the duchess, and desirous of ingratiating himself with the Earl of Bristol, the lady's husband, who was the brother of Jackson's patron.

Jackson's name was first associated with that of the Duchess of Kingston, as a champion of her cause in a singular quarrel between her Grace and Foote, of farcical memory, in the year 1755, thirty-nine years before Jackson appeared in the character of a secret emissary of the French government in Ireland. Foote had publicly announced the production of a humorous piece on the stage, entitled "The Trip to Calais." In this piece he took care to have it privately but extensively circulated that the Duchess of Kingston was to be shown up in the character of "Lady Kitty Crocodile," and the Rev. William Jackson as her ladyship's chaplain. Foote is stated, in the memoirs attributed to Jackson, to have made overtures to the duchess for the suppression of the piece, *moyenant* a sum of £2,000. The duchess is represented as desirous of compounding with the mummer for a sum of fifteen or sixteen hundred pounds. At this juncture the services of the Rev. William Jackson were called into requisition in the press on behalf of the duchess, and they were given with an amount of zeal that outstripped all feelings of prudence, or, indeed, of propriety.[1] Presuming that the memoirs of the duchess are the composition of Mr. Jackson, we may refer to them as his narrative of the pro-

[1] This championship of the cause of the duchess led to Jackson's removal to France, and residence in Paris, when her Grace had taken up her abode there. Her death occurred in Paris in 1788.

ceedings in question, and the part he took in them. An account is given in them of an interview between Jackson and Foote, which could only be derived from the former; and it is tolerably evident that Jackson was the writer of a letter, dated from Kingston House, August 13, 1755, addressed to Foote, in the name of the Duchess of Kingston, which is published in those memoirs; and it is no less obvious that the composition does little credit to the wit or taste of the writer. In this epistle Foote is termed "a slanderous buffoon," "the descendent of a merry-andrew," "a theatrical assassin," "a subservient vassal." The duchess is made to say that "clothed in her innocence as in a coat of mail, she was proof against a host of foes;" and the letter concludes with these words:—"There is something, however, in your pity at which my nature revolts. To make me an offer of pity at once betrays your insolence and your vanity. I will keep the pity you send until the morning you are turned off, when I will return it by a Cupid, with a box of lip-salve, and a choir of choristers shall chant a stave to your requiem." Signed, E. KINGSTON.

In reply to this elegant epistle, Foote writes to her Grace of Kingston:—"I am obliged to your Grace for your intended present on the day, as you politely express it, when I am to be turned off. But where is your Grace to get the Cupid to bring me the lip-salve? That family,

I am afraid, has long quitted your service. Pray, madam, is not Jackson the name of your female confidential secretary? and is she not generally clothed in black petticoats, made out of your Grace's weeds? . . . That you may never want the benefit of clergy in every emergency, is the sincere wish of your Grace's most devoted and obliged humble servant, Samuel Foote."[1]

Jackson was residing in Paris soon after the Revolution had broken out. He was there when the Convention decreed the arrest of all British subjects. Cockayne states he went there on the business of the Duchess of Kingston about four years previous to the trial in 1795. He was acquainted there, in 1793, with the well-known English reformer, John Holdford Stone, and a gentleman connected with Stone in business, residing in Paris, named Benjamin Beresford, who was married to the sister of A. H. Rowan. John Stone had a brother residing in the vicinity of London, engaged in the coal trade.[2] Jackson came to England on a secret mission from the

[1] Life and Memoirs of the Duchess of Kingston, 1789, p. 93.

[2] Stone, Mr. William, coal merchant, Rutland Place, Lower Thames Street, 29th January, 1796, tried for high treason, for conspiring and corresponding with his brother, John Holdford Stone, and William Jackson. On the trial, Jackson is proved to have been called an American by J. Stone, "though in reality he was an Irishman" (see "New An. Reg.," 1796). Jackson's treasonable letters were signed "Thomas Popkins." On this trial the sole parole evidence for the crown was Mr. John Cockayne. "The jury gave no credence to the evidence of so base a man." The verdict of not guilty was received with acclamation.

French government, with two letters of introduction, one to Horne Tooke, another to Dr. Crawford. He arrived in London in January or February, 1794, entered into communication with William Stone, and obtained a statement from some party of the actual disposition of the people of England, and the prospects of coöperation in the event of a French invasion. He had also, immediately after his arrival, entered into communication with a former acquaintance, a Mr. John Cockayne, an attorney resident in Lyons Inn, who had known Jackson, according to his own account, "ten years and upwards."

Cockayne communicated all the secrets of Jackson's mission to Mr. Pitt. But instead of arresting the traitor, and preventing his machinations, that unscrupulous minister actually facilitated them, so far as affording him an opportunity for entrapping innocent men in his seditious snares. He caused Mr. Cockayne to accompany the traitor to Ireland for the purpose of enabling him to communicate with people in that country, and to set about arranging the preliminaries of rebellion.

This act of Mr. Pitt, the immorality of which it is needless to comment on, was eventually attended with results fraught with the greatest danger to British interests which they ever were exposed to from invasion. One of the men

caught in this snare of connived-at-treason, as we have already seen, was Theobald Wolfe Tone. His flight from Ireland, his mission to France, his departure from its shores with 15,000 troops destined for the invasion of Ireland, were the consequences of this treason that was permitted by the British minister to be practised on him. When Mr. Pitt's object was fully accomplished, and the three most prominent leaders of the National and Roman Catholic party were entrapped into sedition, Mr. Jackson was arrested and committed to Newgate on a charge of high treason, the 28th April, 1794.

He remained in confinement for twelve months, less by four days, and on the 23rd of April, 1795, was put on his trial.

While Jackson was preparing for his trial, and being fully apprised of the probable result to be apprehended, a friend, by the kindness of the jailer, was permitted to remain with him until a very late hour at night on one occasion, engaged in the business of his defence. When this was terminated, Jackson attended his friend to the outward door of the prison, which was locked, the key remaining in the lock, and the keeper in a profound sleep—"probably oppressed with wine." There could have been no difficulty in Jackson effecting his escape even subsequently to the departure of his friend. But he adopted a different course. He locked the

door after his friend, awoke the keeper, gave him the key, and returned to his cell.[1]

EXTRACT FROM THE TRIAL OF THE REV. WILLIAM JACKSON FOR HIGH TREASON, IN THE KING'S BENCH OF IRELAND, 23RD APRIL, 1795.

Examination of Mr. John Cockayne.

Attorney-General. Do you recollect any conversation between Mr. Jackson and Mr. Lewins at any time?

A. At any time? Yes.

Q. Where and when?

A. At Hyde's coffee-house.

Q. In what chamber?

A. I believe in that where I slept.

Q. Can you recollect what that conversation was?

A. That was as to Mr. Lewins asking Mr. Jackson for some written documents or authorities, that he might produce them to Mr. Rowan, in order that Mr. Rowan might with confidence talk to Mr. Jackson.

Q. Who is the Mr. Rowan you speak of?

A. Mr. Hamilton Rowan, I think, they called him.

Q. Where was he at that time?

A. In Newgate.

Q. Can you tell whether Mr. Lewins and Mr. Jackson had any conversation respecting Mr. Rowan before?

A. I cannot say to that.

Q. Did you not say that Mr. Lewins came to ask Jackson had he any written document that he might

[1] "Pieces of Irish History," by M'Neven and Emmet.

produce to Rowan to convince him he might talk with confidence?

A. I did.

Q. What answer did Jackson give to that request?

A. I believe he gave him some paper.

Q. Did you see whether he gave any?

A. I cannot swear that I saw him deliver the papers into his hand.

Q. Did Jackson tell you whether he had delivered them?

A. He did tell me that he had delivered some papers to Lewins, and that he wished he had them again.

Q. Did he tell you why he wished to have them again?

A. He said he would not trust them with Lewins if he had them back.

Q. Did he tell you what those papers were?

A. He did not.

Q. Do you know whether he ever got them back?

A. I believe he did.

Q. Did he ever tell you whether he did or not?

A. Not directly in those words.

Q. In what words then?

A. I can only say I believe he did get them back again, but I cannot swear that Mr. Jackson said "Mr. Lewins has given me these papers."—I have every reason to believe that he did get them back.

Q. Can you recollect how soon after your arrival this conversation was?

A. Can you tell me the date of our arrival?

Mr. Attorney-General. I am not to tell you anything.

Witness. We arrived on the second or third, and I should suppose it was four or five days after, but I cannot speak positive.

Q. Had Jackson any interview with Rowan?

A. He had.

Q. When had he the first?

A. Do you ask me in point of date?

Mr. Attorney-General. If you recollect how soon after the conversation with Lewins?

A. I believe a day or two after the conversation with Lewins.

Q. You believe!——

A. I may have hurried myself in saying believe; I know that he had an interview.

Q. Were you present?

A. Yes.

Q. Had he none previous to that that you were present at?

A. I believe he had. If that be not evidence, I cannot say more.

Q. Did Jackson say he had an interview?

A. He told me he had seen Mr. Rowan.

Q. That was before you were present?

A. It was.

Q. And either a day or two after Lewins called for the papers?

A. It was.

Q. Did Jackson tell you what passed between him and Rowan at that interview, or any part of it?

A. He told me he was much satisfied with Mr. Rowan; that his manners were very much those of a gentleman. I recollect nothing more.

Q. Did Jackson tell you whether he was to see Rowan again or not?

A. He said he was.

Q. Did he tell you when that meeting was to be, and what the object of it was?

A. I don't think he said what it was—yes—he said it was to breakfast.

Q. He did not tell you the object?

A. No, I think not.

Q. Did he tell you who was to be there?

A. No.

Q. Did he go?

A. Yes, he went there certainly.

Q. How do you know?

A. I went with him.

Q. How soon was this after the first meeting?

A. Within the compass of three or four days, or a week certainly.

Q. Was there any other person with Rowan when you were there?

A. I really believe—I can't speak positive, and I'll tell you why—there were two or three meetings, and I can't tell at which—there was a relative of Mr. Rowan, I think his father or father-in-law.

Q. Did that relative continue during the whole time you were there?

A. No; he went away.

Q. Do you remember whether there was anybody else?

A. I think Mr. Tone was there, I cannot positively swear.

Q. Do you remember what was the subject of the conversation there?

A. It was on politics.

Q. What politics?

A. Irish affairs.

Q. In what respect?

A. A great deal was said about the United Irishmen, of which Mr. Rowan was a member; some pamphlets were read, and some other matters talked of between them; and there was a conversation about the dissatisfaction of the people in some parts of the kingdom.

Q. Were you present at a meeting with Jackson and Rowan when Tone was present?

A. I was.

Q. Did you know previous to going who was to be there?

A. I now begin to recollect, but I am not positively certain, Jackson said Tone was to be there.

Q. Did you meet any person there?

A. I met Mr. Tone there.

Lord Clonmell. Was that the first meeting or the second?

A. I am not sure; but at some meeting I met Mr. Tone there.

Q. Can you tell for what purpose Jackson went to meet Tone there, or for what purpose he was there?

A. Mr. Jackson did not tell me for what purpose he was to be there.

Q. Was there any other person present but Tone, Rowan, Jackson, and you?

A. No.

Q. Can you tell what was the purport of the conversation?

A. I shall be very little able to complete an answer to that question, because I did not particularly wish to make myself master of that conversation *in toto*.

Q. Be pleased to inform the court what you do recollect of that conversation.

A. There was some paper produced, it was in the hands of Tone, and it was read by him and Rowan.

Lord Clonmell. Read aloud?

A. Not so loud that I could understand it.

Mr. Attorney-General. Did you see that paper again at any time?

A. I had it once.

Q. Would you know it again?

A. I made no mark on it.

Mr. Attorney-General. I did not ask you that.

Witness. If I were to see it I would make you an answer whether I would know it or not; before that I cannot give an answer.

Q. You read it?

A. No, never.

Q. What conversation passed at the meeting where Tone was? I don't ask you the particular words.

A. The conversation among the three was the forming a plan, or talking of a plan, to send somebody to France.

Q. Was any particular person mentioned to go on that errand?

A. Mr. Tone was asked to go.

Lord Clonmell. What—to go?

A. To go.

Mr. Attorney-General. For what purpose was he to go?

A. As I understood——

Q. Did you understand from the conversation for what purpose Tone was to go to France?

Mr. Curran. It is impossible to sustain the question that is put in law—did he understand—it is not a legal question, and for one reason as good as a thousand, that it would be impossible to indict a witness for perjury upon such testimony.

The Court. You need not go further into the objection. (To the witness.) Did you hear the conversation?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you understand it?

A. Yes, in part.

Q. How do you mean in part?

A. They were at one corner of the room, and I in another with a book in my hand, and I did not hear enough to state what they said.

Mr. Attorney-General. Do you know for what purpose Tone was to go to France?

A. I cannot say but from my own conjecture.

Q. Did Jackson ever tell you for what purpose Tone was to go?

A. Never directly so; but from what I understood and from general conversations, I am well satisfied what the purpose was in my own mind.

Q. The Court. What did he say?

A. I cannot repeat it.

Q. What was the substantial import?

A. The substantial import was that he was to go

to France with a paper as I understood—those papers I never saw.

Q. Did Mr. Tone agree to go?

A. At one time he said he would, at another time he receded; he gave his reasons for agreeing to go and for receding.

Mr. Curran. Was Mr. Jackson present?

A. At the reasons that he first gave, Mr. Jackson was not present.

Mr. Attorney-General. Where was it?

A. At Newgate.

Q. Had you a meeting with Tone and Rowan when Jackson was not present?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever hear Tone give any reasons for going or not going when Jackson was present?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where was that?

A. At Newgate.

Q. Who was present?

A. Mr. Rowan, Mr. Tone, and I.

Q. Was Jackson present?

A. I think he was.—[This evidence was objected to.]

Q. Were you at Rowan's lodgings at Newgate at any other meeting than those you have mentioned?

A. How many have I mentioned?

Q. Did you ever see any other person besides Tone at Rowan's lodgings in Newgate?

A. Yes; I saw Dr. Reynolds.

Q. Was Tone present at either of them?

A. Once he was.

Q. How often?

A. Once, if not twice.

Q. Did you see him there more than once?

A. I think twice; it is a year ago, and I have had that on my mind since that has shattered my memory very much.

Q. Was Jackson present at either of those meetings that Reynolds was at?

A. I do not know how to swear positively; I think he was.

Q. Did you go alone to the meeting?

A. I cannot tell; I was alone more than once at Mr. Rowan's.

Q. I ask you did you go alone to the meeting at which Dr. Reynolds was present?

A. If I could have answered that question I would have saved you the trouble of repeating it.

Q. What conversation passed between Rowan, Reynolds and Tone, when you saw them together?

[Counsel for the prisoner objected to this question, Jackson not being proved to have been present.]

Q. Had you any conversation with Jackson respecting Dr. Reynolds?

A. I had.

Q. What was the substance of it?

A. The substance of it was, as to his being a proper or an improper person to go to France.

Question by the Court. What did Jackson say on that subject?

A. Mr. Jackson said he did not so much approve of him as of Mr. Tone.

The Attorney-General. Did he tell you why?

A. I cannot answer that he told me why—the reason why, I thought, I am convinced——

Q. Did Jackson tell you on what errand Reynolds was to have gone?

A. The same as Tone's.

Q. What was that?

A. To carry some paper to France.

Question by the Court. How do you know?

A. Because the paper, whatever it was, was drawn in Newgate while I was there.

Q. Do you know this from your own knowledge, or did Jackson tell you?

A. I cannot say that he told me so *in hæc verba.*

Q. Can you tell substantially what you heard from the prisoner?

A. In substance it was, that he was to go to France with some instructions to the French. It is very difficult to repeat conversations with accuracy; I have heard this in many alternate conversations with Jackson, with Tone, with Reynolds, and with Rowan.

Mr. Curran. My client is to be affected by no conversation that is not sworn to have been in his presonce. The witness says there were some conversations at which he was not present, and therefore it is necessary the witness should swear positively that Jackson was present, when anything respecting those instructions passed.

Witness. Originally Tone was to have gone, but he left Dublin abruptly without saying whether he would or would not go, and then Mr. Rowan applied to Dr. Reynolds, I believe. If I am not point blank in my answers, you will let me tell you why I am not

so, for I would not leave the court under the impression that I would wilfully conceal anything.

Q. Then Jackson told you that Reynolds was to go to France and take a paper; did you learn from him in conversation what that paper was?

A. So many conversations we have had, that it draws me into a maze which of them I shall think of. I was many weeks in company with the prisoner, and the subject was talked of repeatedly. I cannot tell the precise words.

Q. You mistake me; I asked you of conversations in general between you and Jackson. Did he ever tell you for what purpose Reynolds was to be sent to France?

A. To take some written paper with him, to the French Convention I believe; I cannot say positively.

Q. Did Jackson tell you at any time or in any conversation for what purpose Reynolds was to go?

A. I don't know how to answer, there are so many answers to be given this question.

Lord Clonmell. Did you draw any inference from these conversations for what purpose he was to be sent?

Mr. Curran. I beg your Lordship's pardon; but the witness will conceive that he has a right to give his own opinion in answer to that question.

Lord Clonmell. Did you understand unequivocally from those conversations what he was to be sent for—did Jackson ever tell you for what purpose, or to whom Reynolds or Tone were to go?

A. They were to go to France. I cannot tell in

what words to put my answer—I cannot say to whom they were to go; if I was to say one person, I might be wrong, for it was my own understanding of it. I understood from general conversations constantly had, that they were to go with some papers to France. I cannot repeat Jackson's words: my own words will be my understanding of his words.

Attorney-General. The witness said he had already heard so in alternate conversations with Jackson, Tone, etc.

Witness. I adhere to that still.

Lord Clonmell. With instructions for the French—for what purpose?

A. I shall there catch up what I said before—I understood they were to have written instructions for the French; but what they were I don't know.

Attorney-General. To what part of France was the messenger to go?

A. I understood they were to go to Paris.

Q. From whom did you understand that?

A. From them all.

Q. Did either Tone or Reynolds receive any encouragement to go?

A. Yes.

Q. Either Tone or Reynolds in your presence?

A. Yes.

Q. By whom?

A. By the prisoner and Rowan.

Q. What were the encouragements that Jackson held out to Tone?

A. That he would find the French a generous, and I think a brave people—a generous people.

Q. Was there anything in the conversation that led Jackson to say that?

A. What brought that speech from Jackson, I presume, was owing to the difficulties that Tone raised to his going.

Q. What were they?

A. A wife and family.

Q. Were there any others mentioned?

A. The loss of opportunities which might very likely arise from his remaining in this kingdom.

Q. Did Jackson give Reynolds encouragement to go, or use any persuasions?

A. Not much—he did not like him; he would rather have had Tone.[1]

So much for the evidence on which the Rev. W. Jackson was convicted.

Cockayne acknowledged, when cross-examined, that he had been committed and tried in England for perjury in 1793. He further admitted that he had stipulated with Mr. Pitt to have a sum due to him by Jackson of £300, made good to him, before he set out with him for Ireland from London.

In Mrs. Mary Anne Clarke's memoirs, we find Cockayne figuring, and as might be expected, in a disreputable manner. Colonel Wardle, speaking of Colonel French's levying troops in 1804 and 1805, observes, that for that privilege Mrs. Clarke was to receive one guinea out of the

[1] Ridgeway's "Report of Trial of Rev. W. Jackson."

bounty of each man raised, and amongst the various sums received by Mrs. Clarke, was one of £500 "from a Mr. Cockayne, a known solicitor in Lincoln's Inn, for a military friend's advancement (Captain Huxley)."[1]

The trial of Jackson lasted eighteen hours.

At a quarter before four o'clock on Friday morning, April the 23rd, the jury retired for about half an hour, and returned with a verdict of guilty, accompanied with a recommendation to mercy. The prisoner was remanded; the court saying that four days must intervene before judgment could be pronounced.

April the 30th (1795), Mr. Jackson was brought up for judgment. Mr. M'Nally, in the absence of Mr. Curran, as *amicus curiæ,* appeared and moved the court to have the caption read as well as the other parts of the indictment. Lord Clonmell, the chief justice, whose humane and dignified conduct throughout the trial was worthy of the highest praise, concurred in the motion, observing at the same with manifest feelings of sympathy on the prisoner's apparent ill health.

The unfortunate prisoner had taken poison before being brought into court, and the chief object of his doing so was to evade the law, by which his property would have been forfeited had sentence been pronounced upon him, and

[1] "Dodsley's An. Reg.," 1809.

thus to preserve for his family any little means he was possessed of.

There can be very little doubt but that the prisoner on entering the court had informed his counsel of the dreadful act he had committed. On Jackson's appearance in the dock, it is stated, he said to Mr. M'Nally, in the words of Pierre, "We have deceived the senate."

Mr. M'Nally spoke against time on this occasion with great adroitness; he continued addressing the court till Mr. Curran's arrival—prolonging the vain argument for his client's life till the hour of his agony had expired—and counsel and judges all seemed to concur in deferring the sentence as long as possible, till the right hand of the dying man at the bar, which he was called on to hold up, fell slowly to his side—till his death-stricken face grew paler and paler—his failing members weaker and weaker, and more convulsed every instant. While Mr. Justice Downes was yet speaking in reply to Curran's argument, the prisoner fainted away—his head sunk—he fell senseless in the dock and there he lay for a few minutes in the agonies of death, and then expired.[1]

[1] M'Neven, in "Pieces of Irish History," page 97, says:—"Jackson, previous to being brought up for sentence, took a large dose of arsenic. The firmness with which he concealed his excruciating pains, occasioned by that poison, was very remarkable. He concealed the pangs he was suffering so well, that when called on to say what he had to urge why sentence should not be passed upon him, he, though at the time actually unable

The body of the prisoner remained in the dock till nine o'clock the following morning, when an inquest was held, and on examining the stomach, it was discovered that death was the result of an acrid poison of a deadly nature. The jailer, Mr. Gregg, stated in evidence that the deceased was visited by Mrs. Jackson in the morning before he was brought up to court, and witness, on going into the room, perceived Mr. Jackson much agitated, that he complained of indisposition from depression of spirits, and had vomited violently.

The verdict was, that the deceased had died in consequence of having taken some acrid poison of a deadly kind; but how or by whom administered was to the jury unknown.

This much was known, that Jackson took poison with the idea that the little means he possessed would be preserved to his wife and children, if the sentence of the law was not pronounced on him, and that the party who was privy to this act must have well known the nature of the poison, for the time of its operation was evidently calculated on correctly.

A paper was produced at the inquest, which had been found in the pocket of the deceased in

to speak, with a smiling and unembarrassed air, bowed, and pointed to his counsel. His fortitude did not forsake him to the last; for it was scarcely perceived by the spectators that he was ill, when he fell down in the agonies of death in the midst of his counsel's argument."

his own handwriting, of which the following is a copy:—

Turn thee unto me and have mercy upon me; for I am desolate and afflicted!

The troubles of my heart are enlarged.

O bring thou me out of my distresses.

Look upon my affliction and my pain, and forgive me all my sins.

Consider my enemies, for they are many, and they hate me with a cruel violence.

Oh! keep my soul and deliver me.

Let me not be ashamed, for I put my trust in thee.

Whatever commiseration the fate of this unfortunate gentleman may excite, it is impossible to regard this engagement of his in any other light than one which throws discredit on his character. He evidently entered on his office of a secret emissary of the French government for pecuniary considerations. He had no personal knowledge of the wrongs of the Irish people, and no mission from them to warrant him to enter into any communications with a foreign government on their behalf.

The remains of the Rev. Wm. Jackson were attended to the grave by a vast number of respectable persons, and with something of a studied display of sympathy for him.

In St. Michan's Church Burial Ground,

Church Street, there is a tomb-stone with the following inscription:—

> Beneath this stone are interred the remains of the Reverend William Jackson, who died the 23rd of April, 1795, in the Court of Queen's Bench.

The date is wrong in the inscription: Jackson was tried and convicted on the 23rd of April; but he was brought up to receive sentence on the 30th, when he dropt down dead in the dock.

In a pamphlet published by Jackson during his imprisonment (page 90), he says, "his life was a long tissue of misfortunes, especially occasioned by loss of property and friends, by fire and by awful visitations of sickness in his family."

What became of the widow of Jackson I have never been able to learn, but in 1839 Dr. M'Neven informed me that there was a son of his then residing in Rome.

In 1793, while residing in France, Jackson wrote a pamphlet entitled, "The King of England's motives for carrying on the War," a very democratic production, extremely declamatory in its style and Gallican in its politics. During his imprisonment in Newgate he wrote a pamphlet entitled, "A Reply to Paine's Age of Reason," dated March 7th, 1795. Of this production the new "Annual Register" for the same year observes:

Notwithstanding this publication cannot rank with the most able and argumentative defences of the Christian religion, the observations of the writer are entitled to praise, especially if we consider the author's situation when he wrote them, in the confinement of a prison on a charge of high treason, precluded all access to such authorities as he must have been desirous of consulting, had he undertaken a more regular performance.

Of his "Sermons on Practical and Important Subjects," published in London shortly after his execution, the "New Annual Register" for 1795 thus speaks:—

Some, if not all of them, were preached in Tavistock chapel, Drury Lane, and printed several years ago, but, from a variety of circumstances, prevented from being published till the present period. They are distinguished more by liveliness of imagination than depth of thought, and consist more in appeals to the passions than to the reason and judgment. The style and language, as is most commonly the case with this species of pulpit eloquence, are declamatory and flowery, and sometimes turgid and bombastic. One circumstance will strongly recommend them to a numerous class of readers, which is the perpetual recurrence, whatever be the subject, of the peculiar doctrines of orthodoxy.

The "respectable London solicitor," Mr. Cockayne, so late as 1822, was still residing in

the great metropolis, exercising successfully, and of course respectably, his profession. He was then a man of a venerable appearance, and was anxious to enter into explanations with Mr. Charles Phillipps (to whom he had on that occasion offered a brief) respecting his connection with some affairs in Ireland many years previously, which had made him the subject of much conversation at the time. Mr. Phillipps, however, declined the honour Mr. Cockayne was so desirous of thrusting on him. Virtue does not always go unrewarded even in this world. Mr. Cockayne's sacrifice of his old friend and client was requited by a pension of £250 a year.

MEMOIR OF THOMAS ADDIS EMMET

INTRODUCTORY NOTICE

SINCE the publication of the second volume of the first series of this work in 1843, I received from Mr. Robert Emmet of New York, the eldest son of Mr. T. A. Emmet, all the letters and other documents in his possession, that were calculated to throw any light on the public character and career of his father. These papers have reference chiefly to family history, and transactions that occurred during the residence of T. A. Emmet on the Continent, subsequent to his liberation; and to the breach of faith with the state prisoners, on the part of the government, which led to and was the plea for, the renewed communications with the French government on the liberation of the prisoners. Those documents will be found the most important of any of the materials of these volumes.

The necessity of placing beyond all doubt the authenticity of documents which eventually must become historical materials, has led to my prefixing to them the communication which ac-

companies them, from the eldest son and worthy representative of T. A. Emmet; and in taking this step, well calculated though it be to serve the character of my work, and more encouraging for its author than any other reference to his labours could be, it is nevertheless with great reluctance I have determined on the publication of this letter; and the terms in which the writer is pleased to speak of my humble efforts to perform the task which I have assigned to myself, and now nearly brought to a conclusion, have not diminished that reluctance.

FROM ROBERT EMMET, ESQ., TO R. R. MADDEN.

New York, November, 1843.

MY DEAR SIR—I have felt many pangs of self-reproach for having seemingly neglected a duty, and violated a well-merited courtesy towards you, in regard to your memoir of my father's life, and I can only hope that the truth may place me in a more favourable position in your eyes than I fear I now occupy.

It is many months since my brother Thomas handed me the bundle of papers which I now send you (collected and prepared by him, or under his immediate direction) for the purpose of examining them, and making such corrections as I should think proper. I undertook, after having done so, to forward them to you. Unfortunately, in the turmoil and distractions of professional business, I mislaid them, and though I repeatedly searched every part of my office and house, I never could find any trace of them until this very

Mrs. Jane Patten Emmet

From an Oil Painting by Mrs. Elizabeth Emmet Le-Roy, now in Possession of the Emmet Family

day, when on emptying a large bundle of chancery papers, which were put away some time ago among the things to be forgotten in this world, I found this parcel. I can only account for this mischance by their being so similar in appearance and size to our law papers; and I much fear that my discovery of them at this late day may, instead of being useful or gratifying to you, occasion you vexation and regret, as their loss did for me. Trusting, however, that you have not closed your labours to rescue the memory of the United Irishmen from oblivion and obloquy, I send them to you, without even the delay necessary to give them a careful examination.

In regard to this suggestion, I can only add that I have the most entire reliance on your own good taste, judgment, and feeling. In my haste to get these papers out of my unfortunate hands, and on their way to yours, I have not time to say all that I feel towards you (not only as an embryo United Irishman, but as a son of my father) for what you have so nobly undertaken and faithfully accomplished.

I trust I shall yet have an opportunity of tendering to you in person the large share of gratitude which you are entitled to claim from me and mine, and if that occasion should never present itself, be assured that you cannot make yourself our creditor for a greater amount than is sincerely acknowledged.

Believe me, dear Sir, respectfully and truly yours,

(Signed) R. EMMET.

And now it only remains for me to observe that I have deemed it best for the sake of that

authenticity of character which belongs to the biographical notes, accompanying epistolary documents, and notices of the career of T. A. Emmet, which appeared in American periodicals at the time of his death, which I have received from his son, to give them in this memoir precisely in the words and form in which I received them, without any additions or alterations, using them in the order of the distinct epochs and leading events they are connected with—for instance, commencing the memoir with the biographical notice by his sons, introducing the epistolary documents at that part of the memoir which treats of events subsequent to the liberation of the prisoners, and the notices of the career of T. A. Emmet; and in the use of the three sets of documents communicated to me, carefully distinguishing each of them from any matter of my own. It must be obvious this arrangement was indispensable—as, for instance, in the biographical notice much of the early history of the Emmet family was not known to the descendants of T. A. Emmet, and that which was wanting could only be obtained in Ireland. All such matter as seemed to me to be deficient has been supplied at the end of that biographical notice—not incorporated with it, for the reasons above stated; though no doubt the memoir would be in form at least more strictly *en regle* as to its details.

CHAPTER I

EARLY LIFE OF T. A. EMMET

NOTES, ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE ORIGIN AND EARLY CAREER OF THOMAS ADDIS EMMET, BY THOMAS EMMET.

DR. ROBERT EMMET, the father of Thomas Addis, was the second son of Dr. Christopher Emett, an eminent physician, who married Rebecca Temple, grand-daughter of Sir Thomas Temple, created a baronet in November, 1612, by James I.

Dr. Christopher Emett had but two children, Thomas and Robert.

Thomas died at an early age, leaving but one daughter, who died shortly after her father.

Robert studied the profession of his father, and practised for some time in Cork before he removed to Dublin, where he resided during the remainder of his life. He reached the highest grade in his profession, and for a long period held the situation of state physician.

The family are in possession of a very large and valuable piece of plate, presented to him by the trustees of St. Patrick's Hospital (Swift's Hospital for the insane), upon which is the following inscription:

"To Robert Emmet,[1] Esq., State Physician, as a memorial, not compensation, of the many services rendered by him to that institution, as Governor, Physician, and Treasurer thereto.—February 3rd, 1783."

[1] "The mode of spelling the family name had been some years previously changed by the doctor (for what reason is not now known) from Emmett to Emmet."

Dr. Robert Emmet, in 1760, married Elizabeth Mason, daughter of James Mason, of Killarney, by Catherine Power. He had a numerous family, only four of whom lived to become of age, viz., Christopher Temple, Thomas Addis, Maryanne, and Robert.

Christopher Temple, his eldest son, also married into the Temple family. He married Anne Western Temple, niece of Sir John Temple, and daughter of Robert Temple and Harriett Shirley, daughter of Governor Shirley of New England.

Robert Temple, after the American revolution, went with his family, consisting of three daughters, to Dublin, where his aunt, Mrs. Dr. Emmet, then resided. The Temple family all came to Dr. Emmet's house, and remained there a long time; while there, Christopher Temple Emmet married the eldest daughter, and a son of Sir J. Blackwood married the second. Christopher Temple Emmet was endowed with superior talents, and graduated from Trinity College, having received many of the honours conferred by that institution. He studied law, and after being called to the bar gave great promise of celebrity in his profession, and was considered one of the most eloquent and learned men at the Irish bar. His death, which was sudden and caused by over-exertion in his profession, created a great sensation at the time; and notices of his character and death, and the high estimation in which he was held, will be found in the public journals of the day.

Thomas Addis was the third son of Dr. Emmet.[1] He was born in Cork on the 24th of April, 1764. It

[1] Dr. Emmet had a son next in age to Christopher Temple, who died in, or previously to, 1777.—R. R. M.

is now uncertain where he received the rudiments of his early education. He passed through Trinity College with great credit and distinction. After leaving college he went to Edinburgh to pursue the study of medicine, for which profession he was designed by his father.

After leaving Edinburgh he went to London, to attend the hospitals, and acquire greater proficiency in surgery and medicine. He was there attached to Guy's Hospital, and became the intimate friend and companion of Dr. Babington, for whom he retained through life the most sincere regard. He subsequently spent some time on the continent of Europe, and travelled through France, Germany, Switzerland, and Italy.

In Paris he received the account of the death of his elder brother, and immediately returned home. He then at the request of his father changed his profession, and commenced the study of the law in the Temple, London, being then about twenty-five years of age. In 1791, and shortly after his admission to the bar, he married Jane Patten, daughter of the Rev. John Patten, of Clonmel, and Margaret Colville. Maryanne, the sister of Thomas Addis, married Robert Holmes, an eminent barrister in Dublin, who is still living there.[1] She died at an early age, leaving but one daughter, who married George Lenox Conyngham, Esq., now of the War-office, London. Mrs. Holmes was also remarkable as a woman of very superior intellect and literary acquirements.

[1] Robert Holmes died on the 7th of October, 1859, at the house of his daughter, Mrs. Cunningham, in Eaton-place, London, in his 95th year.

Robert was the youngest son of Dr. Emmet. He went through his academic studies with distinguished credit, and entered Trinity College. He was prevented from graduating by his political opinions and conduct; but, during the time he remained in college, he was pre-eminent as a scholar, gaining prizes in all his studies.[1]

Considering the variety and extensive course of Mr. Emmet's studies, the number of societies he had belonged to, the prominent stations he had occupied in them, the enlarged views he had acquired from the study of ancient and modern history, we cannot be surprised that, upon his return to his native land, her degraded and oppressed condition should early claim his attention.

With all the qualities that distinguish a humane, just, and generous mind, he had a bold, enterprising, active, and sanguine disposition. He knew his country's history too well to be in doubt as to the true causes of her misery, and he could not in silence brood over wrongs which by his exertions might possibly be redressed. In this he had no ambition to gratify, or individual benefit to obtain, but everything to risk on the troubled water of revolution, uncertainty, and danger. He wrote many political essays, which can probably be better obtained in Ireland than here; there are none among his papers. The details of the part he

[1] In "The Dublin Journal," June 30th, 1795, in a notice of the quarterly examinations held in Trinity College, Dublin, we find a list of twenty-four names of young gentlemen who obtained premiums, and amongst these we find the name "Emmett" preceded by that of "Curran." The persons above referred to were Robert Emmet and Richard Curran, eldest son of John Philpot Curran.—R. R. M.

took in the rebellion can also be better obtained from persons in Ireland. It was a subject upon which he never conversed with his family, nor has he left any papers whatever relating to it.

The preceding notes respecting the early career and origin of Thomas Addis Emmet I have given as they were furnished to me by his sons. The details of both, which remain to be supplied, I now lay before my readers.

CHAPTER II

FOLK-LORE OF THE EMMETS

THE notes of the sons of Thomas Addis Emmet, that have reference chiefly to the career of their illustrious father, leave many deficiences to be supplied in the accounts given of the origin of this remarkable family—perhaps one of the most remarkable, in an intellectual point of view, of any family that we have authentic accounts of.

DR. ROBERT EMMET

This gentleman was a native of the town of Tipperary, where his father, Christopher Emmet, exercised the profession of a physician, and represented a family of English descent, whose founders came into Ireland with the invaders or adventurers prior to the reign of Charles I., as we may infer from the following data:

We find in the "Fifteenth Annual Report of Commissioners of Records of Ireland, 1825," p. 622, among the enrolments of adjudications in favour of claims of (the 1649) officers preserved in the Exchequer, the name and claim of John Emmett.

In the "*Inquisitiones in Officio Rotulorum*

Cancellariæ Hiberniæ," vol. i., we find the name Emmettston in the *Index locorum* of the Inquisitions of the county Meath, *temp. Jac. I.* and also *Car. I.*

But in no other place, in the six volumes of the Reports of the Commissioners of Public Records, do I find the name Emmett or Emett.

"In 1656, in the Court of Chancery in Ireland, there was a bill filed by a person named William Emmett, and several suits were subsequently instituted, down to the year 1698, by and against Katherine Emmett, Thomas Emmett, and Cornet Emmett. . . And in the reign of Queen Anne there was a Thomas Emmett, a justice of the peace for the county of Limerick."[1]

Dr. Robert Emmet's father, Christopher Emmet, who practised his profession in the town of Tipperary, died there in 1743. In his will mention is made of his wife, Rebecca, granddaughter of Sir Thomas Temple; his two sons, Thomas and Robert; a brother named William; a nephew, Christopher, probably the son of the preceding William; his sister-in-law, Elizabeth Temple, residing in Dublin; and Agnes Cuthbert of Castlebar. From his will, lodged in the Prerogative Court, Dublin, the following abstract is taken:

Christopher Emmett, of Tipperary, by his

[1] "Notes and Queries," September, 1857. No. 90, p. 233.

last will, dated 20th April, 1743, bequeathed to his wife, Rebecca Emmett, the use of her own room and the furniture thereof, in the house in which he then resided, and all his plate, during her widowhood, and a sum of £50 sterling; also his interest in the lease of the fairs and markets of said town. And in case she should thereafter marry, a further sum of £50. And as to all the rest and residue of his worldly substance, same to be divided among his two sons, Thomas Emmett and Robert Emmett. And in case of the death of his said sons in the lifetime of his said wife, his executors to pay her the sum of £200 sterling; also a sum of £50 each to his sisters-in-law, Elizabeth Temple, of the city of Dublin, and Agnes Cuthbert, of Castlebar. The remainder to be divided between his brother William and sisters, and his nephew Christopher; with power to his executors to sell and dispose of his freehold and personal estate for the purposes aforesaid. Administration granted to his wife, 14th November, 1743. Ambrose Harding, Joseph Whyte, and Samuel Taylor, and his said wife, executors named in said will.

The widow of Dr. Christopher Emmett died in the house of her son, Robert, in Dublin, as may be inferred from the following obituary notice in "The Hibernian Journal": "24th November, 1774, died in Molesworth-street, in her 74th year, Mrs. Rebecca Emmett." By

"The Dublin Directory" for that year we find Dr. Robert Emmet was then residing in Molesworth-street. The alteration in the spelling of his name was made by him prior to the year 1760, for in the original deed of marriage settlement—perfected in Cork the 10th of November, 1760, which document came into my possession from a member of his wife's family—his signature to it is Robert Emmet. And from that period certainly the name was thus written by him and his descendants. This fact, though apparently trivial, is of importance, for a document purporting to be signed by his son, Robert, and disposed of a few years ago in England as the original draft of his celebrated speech on his trial, was discovered by me not to be in his handwriting, principally by the spelling of the name, Emmett, instead of Emmet, which was the way he invariably wrote his name.

Dr. Robert Emmet, I am informed by his kinsman, the late John St. John Mason, Esq., was born about 1720 in Tipperary; he graduated in Edinburgh, and, probably prior to his father's death in 1743, he established himself in Cork, and practised his profession there for several years, and evidently with success —though, strange to say, after much inquiry of the oldest physicians of that city, and some researches amongst the archives of the literary and scientific institutions longest in being there, I

have not been able to discover the slightest trace of his connection with that city.

Mr. J. St. John Mason informs me that "It was whilst the doctor was practising in Cork he made the acquaintance of Miss Elizabeth Mason (aunt of my informant), at the house of her brother, James Mason, junior, with whom she was then residing. She was the daughter of James Mason, of Ballydowney, near Killarney, Kerry. He married that lady in the year 1760. He was in good practice, and was considered very skilful in fever cases.

Dr. Emmet in person was rather tall. In the cast of his countenance there was a strong resemblance to the pictures of Sterne we see prefixed to his works.

He did not remain very long in Cork after his marriage. He had six children: Henry and Elizabeth (who died young), Christopher Temple, Thomas Addis, Maryanne, and Robert. Speaking of two of his sons —Christopher Temple and Thomas Addis—he (J. St. J. M.) has heard him say: "*Uno avulso haud deficit alter.*"

The following particulars respecting the marriage will be found important:

ABSTRACT OF SETTLEMENT EXECUTED ON THE MARRIAGE OF ROBERT EMMET, ESQ., WITH MISS ELIZABETH MASON, FROM THE ORIGINAL DEED IN POSSESSION OF R. R. M.

The deed is dated the 15th of November, 1760.

The signatures to it are the following: Robert Emmet, Elizabeth Mason (the future Mrs. Emmet), James Mason (father of the preceding Elizabeth), John Mason (son of the preceding James, and father of the late John St. John Mason, Esq., first cousin of Robert Emmet, who was thrown into prison in 1803, and kept in confinement for many years subsequent to the insurrection of that year), likewise Henry Hilliard, and John Gunn.

The deed recites that on the marriage of James Mason with Catherine, the mother of said Elizabeth (an only daughter) and John (eldest son), he executed a deed, bearing date the 15th December, 1732, vesting in trustees John Gunn and Henry Hilliard, Esqs., certain lands, viz.: The town and lands of Cahircrohan, East Clyng, Colegarraff, Ahaleebegg, Annagh, Ballydowny, Farranispig, Knocksardnead, and West Clyng, in the baronies of Magony and Trughenaking, in the county of Kerry, to raise the sum of £500, as portions for the younger children of said marriage. That sum, by a subsequent provision in the deed, was limited to £450. And by the present settlement it was agreed that the marriage portion of Elizabeth Mason should be £500, to be raised out of said lands, and laid out by above-named trustees in land, with the consent of Robert Emmet, and that the interest of said sum, as also of the sum of £100, which Rob-

ert Emmet was to vest in said trustees, was to be paid by them to Robert Emmet during his life, and after his death to the said Elizabeth, his wife, and after her death to the issue of said marriage, to be proportionally divided amongst them, at the attainment of each of twenty-one years of age.

In the original deed the signature of Dr. E. is Robert Emmet, but in the body of the deed, wherever his name occurs—except in one place —it is written Emmett. It may be concluded that the change in the name was made by him about the period of his marriage.

Dr. Emmet's removal to Dublin was attended with immediate advantages that could not be attributed alone or chiefly to his professional merits, but probably to his connection with the Temple family mainly, and the nobleman who was then viceroy, the Marquis of Buckingham.

In "The Dublin Directory" for 1771, the name Robert Emmett (*sic*) appears with the title, "State Physician." His predecessor in that office—Dr. Robert Robinson—had held it from 1753 to that period. In the same year—in virtue of his office of State Physician—he became a governor of Swift's Hospital for the Insane. In the Directory for 1772 he is designated, "Robert Emmet, State Physician, Molesworth-street," at p. 53; and at p. 115, "Robert Emmet, M. D., Licentiate in Physic of the Col-

lege of Physicians." The title of "State Physician" is given him in that and each succeeding Directory, and the name is written Emmet down to the year 1803, included, when it disappears. (His death had taken place in November, 1802.) In the Directory for 1780 his place of residence No. 109, Stephen's-green, west, appears for the first time; so his removal from Molesworth-street must have taken place in 1779.[1] In the Directory for 1785, at p. 62, in the list of "State Officers," we find the following remarkable notification: "State Physician, Robert Emmet, M. D., F. R. S., and Thomas Addis Emmet, M. D." But in the following year the name of T. A. Emmet, M. D., disappears from the list of State Officers, and again appears, in 1787, in the list of Physicians: "T. A. Emmet, M. D., abroad." And though not connected with the immediate subject of this notice, it may be added that in the Directory for 1785 we find an appointment that proved, thirteen years later, a happy one for Surgeon (subsequently General) Lawless, that of "George Steward, Esq., State Surgeon," who, in 1790, was appointed "Surgeon General."[2]

[1] According to D. J. O'Donoghue in his "Life of Robert Emmett" (Dublin, 1902), Dr. Emmet moved to Stephen's Green prior to 1778. Mr. D. A. Quaid has dealt with the subject in the *United Irishmen* and has proved that Robert Emmet was born in Stephen's Green on March 4, 1778.

[2] The timely information of the intention of government to arrest Surgeon Lawless and Surgeon Dease, the evening before

In "Grattan's Life," by his son, the character of Dr. Emmet is placed in an absurd and injurious light. He is represented as instilling into the minds of his sons the most extravagant principles—as exaggerating the duties of patriotism to the point of recommending the performance of the most insane acts; of having his "pill and his plan" ready for every evil, physical or political; and of so drugging his prescriptions with politics that "he would kill the patient who would take the one, and ruin the country that would listen to the other." The same passion for antithesis—for aggregating striking contrasts and strong dissimilarities in the same paragraph, which distinguished the most splendid of the speeches of the gentleman on whose authority this account is given, is observable in this statement. The person living who is the best qualified to speak of the habits and principles of Dr. Emmet, a gentleman intimately connected by ties of friendship and other relations with his family, who lived under his roof, and still has a perfect remembrance of his character and of his conduct towards his children, declares that, beyond passing observations on the duty which every man owed his country, there are no grounds

the arrest of the Sheares, was sent to both gentlemen by Surgeon General Steward. Lawless effected his escape; Dease had not the energy to attempt it. The intimation of the intended arrests was conveyed by Surgeon Peile, who in after years communicated the fact to Surgeon Cusack.

for those injurious statements. The plain fact of the matter is, some of the leading members of the Whig Club and of the opposition in parliament, whose fierce denunciations of the government, whose representation of the corruption of parliament—the evils of the intolerable borough system, had inflamed the people to the highest pitch of political frenzy—became desirous to account for the acts which they committed when labouring under the excitement of passions thus inflamed, by ascribing to democratic violence, or the mischievous counsels of the persons by whom they were guided, all the misfortunes which befell the people. Dr. Emmet was a man of warmth of feeling—frank, upright, and steadfast in his opinions. His lady was a person of a noble disposition and of a vigorous understanding, fit to be the mother of three such children as Christopher Temple, Thomas Addis, and Robert Emmet. The parents of such children ought to have been exempt from the attempt to represent them as unfaithful to their parental duty, or unfortunate in their notions of its obligations.

Poor Dr. Emmet and his wife, from the time of the arrest of their son Thomas Addis, gradually sank under the calamity which laid the proud hopes of their old age in the dust. They were no longer the same persons. In their appearance, in their conversation, their mode of life consequent on the abandonment of their former

enjoyments, and the cessation of intercourse with those who formerly were the companions and associates of their imprisoned son (now "all gone, and not a friend to take his fortune by the arm"), the change became obvious to the few who proved in the time of their adversity that they were friends indeed in their acts and thoughts, and not in name alone. Dr. Emmet died at Casino, near Miltown, in the autumn of 1802. He was buried in the graveyard of St. Peter's church, in Aungier-street, on the right-hand side of the entrance, close to the wall, on the south side.

An erroneous account has been given of Dr. Emmet's remains having been interred in the churchyard of St. Anne's church in Dawson-street. About four years ago I discovered the tomb of Dr. Emmet in the cemetery of St. Peter's church, Aungier-street, with the following inscription on it:

Here lie the remains of
Robert Emmet, Esq., M. D.,
Who died the 9th of December, 1802,
In the 73rd year of his age.

Here also the remains are interred of the widow of Dr. Emmet, who survived her husband only nine months. This poor lady lingered out the remainder of her days—few and sorrowful as they were—in her new place of residence, Bloomfield, near Donnybrook. She preceded

her youngest son, Robert, to the tomb by a few days. From the period of the arrest of her son, T. A. Emmet, in March, 1798, her existence was a blank. She died—mercifully was it ordained—some days before the execution of Robert Emmet.

CHRISTOPHER TEMPLE EMMET

Christopher Temple Emmet was brought up to the bar; he was born in Cork in 1761; was educated at the school of Mr. Kerr, and entered college in 1775, at the age of fourteen, under Mr. Hales. He obtained a scholarship in 1778. He was called to the bar in 1781; was appointed one of her majesty's counsel in 1787; and during his short professional career, a period not exceeding eight years (for he died in 1789), his brilliant talents and eminent legal attainments obtained for him a character that in the same brief space was probably never gained at the Irish bar.

He married Anne Western Temple, the eldest daughter of Robert Temple, Esq., in 1781, a distinguished American loyalist, who had returned home with his family not long previously —"some time after the battle of Bunker's-hill, which (I am informed by Mr. J. St. J. Mason) he witnessed."

"He was certainly," says Mr. Mason, "one of the brightest ornaments of the Irish bar, and

the most eloquent man of his day. He was of a fuller figure and stouter person than T. A. Emmet, but not so tall. He was remarkably near-sighted, even more so than T. A. Emmet. The latter, however, made more use of his eye-glass—spectacles he never used, previously, at least, to his departure from Ireland."

In his profession, his eminence as a lawyer was acknowledged by all his cotemporaries; nor in literary pursuits was he less distinguished. Several poetical pieces of his appeared in a collection of original poems, published by Edkin, in 1789, and others in a later edition in 1803. One of these, addressed to the Earl of Buckinghamshire, " The Decree," for beauty of imagery and smoothness of versification, is not surpassed by many poems in our language.

Mr. Grattan, in his memoirs of his father, gives the following account of Temple Emmet:

> Temple Emmet, before he came to the bar, knew more law than any of the judges on the bench; and if he had been placed on one side, and the whole bench opposed to him, he could have been examined against them, and would have surpassed them all; he would have answered better both in law and divinity than any judge or any bishop in the land. He had a wonderful memory—he recollected everything—it stuck to him with singular tenacity. He showed this in his early youth, and on one occasion he gave a strong instance of it. There existed at that time in Dublin College,

an institution called the Historical Society; there were subjects selected for discussion, and prior to the debate there was an examination in history. On one occasion the books happened to be mislaid, and it was thought no examination could have taken place; but Emmet, whose turn it was to be in the chair, and who had read the course, recollected the entire, and examined in every part of it, with surprising ability.

Mr. Grattan speaks of his eloquence as abounding in imagery, which gave too much of a poetic character to his oratory. The few, however, of his cotemporaries who were living within the author's recollection entertained a different opinion of its merits; and amongst them were some of the most highly gifted of their countrymen. The kinsman of Temple Emmet, J. St. John Mason, informs me that one of the most remarkable speeches made in the Historical Society was delivered by Temple Emmet, at the close of the sessions, when he was under sixteen years of age.

The Historical Society—"the normal school" of Irish eloquence—the first arena on which the talents of the most distinguished men of Ireland of all parties strove for mastery, is intimately connected with the history of the subject of this memoir.

Its origin and early proceedings excited no less interest than the career and destiny of those who were its brightest ornaments; and to that

interest the research is due which has enabled the author to give some particulars respecting the society to the public.

The archives of the Historical Society, after much inquiry, were by him traced to the possession of the son of one of its original members, Mr. Kinchela of Kilkenny, late mayor of that city; and to that gentleman's liberality he is indebted for the use of the records in question. They consist chiefly of the laws, some fragments of the reports of the proceedings, and of the dispute of the Society with the Board of the University. These documents are connected more especially with the proceedings and constitution of the second Historical Society, which was established in 1792.

HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

The first Historical Society was formed in 1770 by some members of Trinity College, Dublin, who, observing the deficiencies of the academic system, and the total neglect of every useful branch of the *belles-lettres* in the under-graduate course, devised this means of encouraging a taste for History and Elocution; every allusion to cotemporary events or persons being prohibited. No persons were eligble but students of long standing, and fellows as honorary members.

The Society flourished for about twenty-two years. The names of the greatest men that Ire-

land can boast of are to be found on the roll of its members. Temple Emmet, Plunket, Bushe, the friend of the latter, T. W. Tone, who filled the situation of Auditor, and so early as 1786 had already "obtained three medals from the Historical Society."[1]

The old Society, having lost several of its ablest members, and amongst others its pride and ornament, Temple Emmet, had gradually declined. In 1792, it was remodelled, or rather revived, under a new name, "The Junior Historical Society."

The record of its proceedings in the documents above named is scanty and defective. The code of laws is perfect; and the following brief outline of the more important rules may not be uninteresting:

The Society to meet in November, and continue its sittings till the month of June following, every year, on each Monday evening.

At every meeting the President to appoint two members to bring in two questions for debate each; one of which the Society was to choose for the next evening's debate. One of the said members to defend, the other to oppose the subject of debate.

At every meeting, thirty pages of history to be made the subject of examination.

Graduates of the university to be excused from such examination.

[1] "Tone's Life."

Elections to be made and votes taken by ballot.

Every member residing in college to give his chambers in turn for the use of the Society.

Every person on the college books, or a graduate of the university, to be entitled to be proposed for admission.

At the conclusion of each debate, each member to give in the name of the person, in his opinion, who was the best speaker on the question.

Once a month the name to be laid before the Society of the person having the greatest number of commendations in oratory; and where the number shall exceed fifteen, a medal to be awarded to him.

A similar reward for the best answers at each month's meeting, at the regular examinations on historical subjects.

The office of president to continue for one month; each session to close with a speech from the chair.

The Historians, in providing for their intellectual refections, appear not to have neglected refreshments of another kind; for it is enacted, that

The treasurer shall find the Society in tea and cakes, prior to the chair being taken.

In the few reports of the proceedings which are given, the names of the speakers in most instances are omitted.

The first meeting of this society, on the 16th April, 1792, was opened by Mr. John Kinchela,

with an address, explanatory and commendatory of the objects of the institution.

On the next subject of debate, "Whether the death of King Charles I. was justifiable?" a very able speech in the negative was pronounced, and is given at length in the report of the proceedings.

At a meeting the 5th of April, 1792, on the question, "Whether the conquest of barbarous nations for the purpose of civilisation is justifiable?" the report is given of a speech in the affirmative of the exploded proposition; it is an able speech, however, and displays no little ingenuity in making "the worse appear the better reason."

The society, in 1794, encountered the hostility of the Board of Fellows of Trinity College.

The admission of a graduate into the Historical Society, the Rev. Mr. C———, who had been expelled from college, was made the pretext for bringing down the censure of the Board on Mr. Hugh Kerr, one of its leading members, and a threat of expulsion of any student of college who should attend a meeting of the society outside the college walls. This proceeding, and other vexatious steps, such as the withdrawal of the use of the hall formerly granted for their meetings, on the original terms, put an end to the meeting of the Historical Society within the walls of the college. The Exhibition Room was

engaged for their meetings, the latter end of April, 1794. The Board in the early part of April had plainly signified its disapproval of the proceedings of the society; Tone, Corbet, Browne, Robert Emmet (then a very young lad), John Shears, James M'Cabe, Peter Burrowes, Kerr, and Lawson, were at that period amongst its stirring members; while Hayden and M'Carthy, Scully, Power, and Ardagh stood less prominently forward, and were influenced more by the love of letters than enthusiasm and politics in attending. Several of the former class were suspected by the Board of entertaining republican principles, and of having made the Historical Society a theatre for the discussion of modern politics. The Board took an indirect mode of attacking the society; one of the Fellows, the Rev. George Millar, at a meeting of the society, took occasion to inform an old member of the society that if he did not immediately quit the room he would move for his expulsion. The grounds for this menace were, that the member had been expelled from college, and none but those in college or on its books were privileged to be members of the Historical Society. The member withdrew, and the following day an order from the Board directed that no person should be admitted to the debates of the Historical Society whose name was not on the books.

The order for the exclusion of extern members was the beginning of the war, which was carried on with much vehemence for a length of time, between the College Board and the society, and enlisted in the quarrel the wit, eloquence, learning, and satirical propensities of both parties.

The issue of a contest with the heads of an institution in which Lord Clare exerted authority, might have been easily foreseen. The Historical Society got the character of a Jacobin club, its members were placed under the ban of the lord chancellor, and in 1798, at a visitation held by his lordship at Trinity College, one of the charges brought against a number of the students, arraigned on that occasion, was that of belonging to the Historical Society. The society broke down; Tone, who was to the second society what Temple Emmet was to the first, was then furnishing work for history instead of discussing its details. Among the students who were expelled from college in 1798, were some of the leading members of the society, and one who had withdrawn his name at that time from the college books—Robert Emmet—whose loss to the society was not the least of its disasters; nor did it long survive that loss.

In 1810, the Historical Society was again revived. Some young barristers of liberal politics and distinguished abilities, Counsellor Finlay,

Mr. Taylor, and Mr. John Martin Anster (of subsequent celebrity as a poet—J. Anster, Esq., LL. D.), whose beautiful "Ode to Fancy" obtained the prize medal of the society in 1813, were among its leading members. This society shared the fate of its predecessors in 1815 or 1816; and once more it rose from its ashes, and still is in existence, recalling, not indeed the bright and palmy days of the original society, but in some slight degree the dawning talents that were displayed in the original institution.

Christopher Temple Emmet, in the full vigour of mind and manhood, died of a few days' illness, whilst absent from his home and family, on the Munster Circuit, in 1789, at the early age of twenty-seven, leaving a daughter, born in April, 1785, at Stephen's-green. (See Walker's "Hibernian Magazine.")

The widow of C. Temple Emmet only survived him a few months; she died in November, 1789.

Christopher Temple Emmet's daughter, Catherine, and only child, after the calamities and dispersion of her family, went to the United States, with the intention probably of remaining with some members of her father's family who were residing in New England, but returned after a short absence to England.

She had been for some years under the care of

a lady who kept a school at Liverpool, and who subsequently became the second wife of Counsellor Robert Holmes.

Eventually Miss Catherine Emmet went to England to reside, and lived, I believe, to the time of her decease at the house of the Rev. Mr. Hazlitt of Addlestone, near Chertsey, the father of the celebrated writer, William Hazlitt.

Of the two brothers of C. Temple Emmet, the subsequent memoirs of T. Addis and Robert Emmet will be found to give all the authentic information ever likely to be given to the public.

It remains here to say a few words of the sister of these brothers—one worthy of the name of Emmet, and of that race of which Ireland has so much reason to be proud.

Maryanne, the sister of T. A. Emmet, married Mr. Robert Holmes, a distinguished barrister, in the latter part of 1799. This amiable and accomplished lady died about 1804, leaving one daughter (born in 1800), who married Mr. George Lennox Cunningham of the War-office, London. Mrs. Holmes shared in the talents which seemed to be hereditary in her family. At the time that the projected Union was exciting general interest, two very remarkable pamphlets appeared which were ascribed to her—one of which, called "An Address to the People of Ireland, showing them why they ought to sub-

mit to an Union," published in 1799, there is no doubt of having been written by her.

This pamphlet is written with very great power, and its mode of *advocating* the Union may be gathered from its motto:

"Of comfort no man speak;
Let's talk of graves, of worms, and epitaphs."—SHAKESPEARE.

The design of this extraordinary production was to expose to the people the true character of the new-born patriotism of such men as John Claudius Beresford, the Right Hon. John Foster, Lord Kingsborough, Lord Cole, Colonel Barry, Messrs. Whaley, Saurin, Vereker, and Bagwell; many of whom were then (1799) red-hot "patriots," who in the year following were not ashamed to sell their country, but thankful to Providence (as one of them had the candour to acknowledge) that they had a country to sell.

Mrs. Maryanne Holmes—the sister of C. Temple, T. Addis, and Robert Emmet—died in 1804. Her remains were interred with those of her parents in the churchyard of St. Peter's church in Aungier-street.[1]

[1] Mr. Robert Holmes married secondly a young lady who had kept a school at Liverpool, and died within a year of her marriage. With this young lady—Mrs. Elizabeth Holmes—the daughter of Temple Emmet had been educated. In the year 1859, this venerable man—not less remarkable for his vigorous mind and manly virtues than for the republican simplicity and sternness of his principles, and the uniform consistency of his long and honourable career—died in London at the house of his daughter.

The only child of this highly gifted lady, born in 1800, who married Mr. George Lennox Cunningham, has given evidence in her writings of the fact I have already stated, that talents were hereditary in the Emmet family.

CHAPTER III

T. A. EMMET'S STUDIES

THOMAS ADDIS EMMET was born in Cork on the 24th of April, 1764. He was placed at the same school that his brother had been sent to, and at the age of fourteen entered Trinity College, in 1778, under Mr. Hales. His career at college, if less brilliant than that of his brother Temple, was such as gave ample promise of his future eminence. His qualities were not of the same shining character. The powers of his imagination were less remarkable than the solidity of his judgment and the logical precision and acumen of his reasoning faculties. His oratorical efforts were distinguished by no bold flights of impassioned eloquence; they abounded not in the flowers of a poetic imagination, but in plants of a less precocious maturity—of a more enduring bloom: an impressive earnestness of manner, an honesty of purpose, and sincerity of conviction in the delivery of his sentiments; a strict adherence to truth; a manly scorn of the meanness of subterfuge or falsehood; a closeness of reasoning that never deviated from its essential line of argu-

ment; and on occasions which called for the display of fervid feelings an outbreak of indignant or enthusiastic eloquence, which formed a striking contrast with the apparent calmness of reflection and coldness of feeling which his staid demeanour and contemplative cast of countenance would seem to indicate.

His physical conformation was not robust; he was measured in his gait, and retiring and unobtrusive in his deportment. In his dress he was careless—almost negligent; he bestowed no attention on personal appearance. His head was finely formed—it had all the compactness that a phrenologist would look for in the head of a man of profound thought; and the expression of his countenance indicative of integrity and straightforwardness that inspired confidence and respect, and made those who came into contact with him feel the presence of a man of inflexible principles, and of fixed, well considered opinions. A slight cast in his eyes, accompanied by a habit of closing his eye-lids, incidental to what is termed "nearness of sight," gave a kind of peering expression to his regard. It was that of a man who communed more with himself than with external things, but its predominant expression was benevolence: it was the regard of a man whose suavity of disposition was too great to be spoiled by studious habits, by strong convictions on political subjects, or a de-

termined purpose to act upon them when the occasion came for action.

Thomas A. Emmet, being designed for the medical profession, was sent to Edinburgh to pursue his studies. There he became the fellow-student of Mr. (subsequently Sir) James Mackintosh; of Dr. Samuel Mitchill, who became celebrated in the pursuit of natural history in America; of Dr. Rogers, afterwards of New York; and the intimate acquaintance of Dugald Stewart. He remained at Edinburgh during the years 1783-4-5-6, and his time there was most industriously employed. He devoted himself with uncommon ardour to his professional studies: two of his medical books are now in the possession of the author, one in the French and the other in the Latin language; the ample notes, sufficient to fill a small-sized volume, in either books, are in the language of each work. His popularity with his fellow-students was so great, that at one time he was the president of no less than five societies, connected with literary, scientific, and medical subjects: the Speculative, the Royal Medical, the Physical Societies, &c.

The celebrated American naturalist and physician, Dr. Samuel Mitchill, the fellow-student of Thomas Addis Emmet, at the request of many of the friends of both, pronounced a discourse on the life and character of Emmet in the New York City Hall, the 1st of March, 1828; from

which the following passages, illustrative of the early career of T. A. Emmet, are extracted:

In October, 1784, I found T. A. Emmet at the university of Edinburgh. He had, in the September preceding, received the degree of doctor of medicine in due form—pursuant to a decree of the faculty and an order of the academic senate. The velvet cap had been put upon his head by the distinguished principal, William Robertson. He staid there during the winter which succeeded his graduation, for the purpose of further improvement. Gentlemen who can afford it, and are not pressed immediately into business, not unfrequently do so. I soon became acquainted with him; I even sought an introduction, for he was in high consideration among the students, and he was reputed by the professors and seniors as having performed his exercises and gone through the prescribed course of study with more than common ability.

The statutes impose upon a candidate for the doctorate, among other tasks, the publication of a dissertation upon some professional subject in the Latin language. Mr. Emmet, possessing a taste for chemistry, had defended, at the solemn examination, a composition *de aerë fixo vel acido aereo*—the production upon which Professor Black had founded much of his well-earned fame. Experimenters had proceeded at that day far enough to ascertain that it was an air fixed in or attracted by other bodies, as by chalk, for example; and they had proved that it was of an acid quality, capable of changing the purple of litmus to red. But they had not discovered that its basis was elementary

charcoal, nor, that in correct nomenclature, it ought to be called *carbonic* acid. The performance was considered to have been his own, and not the work of one of those useful hirelings who prepare exercises for the dull and lazy.

As to the style it was deemed a good specimen of modern Latinity, and in regard to the matter it was reckoned one of the best inaugural tracts. Mr. Smellie, one of the printers to the university, a good naturalist, and a fair judge of literary and scientific matters, had made a selection of those collegiate pieces that went through his hands, which he published in a volume from time to time under the title of "*Thesaurus Medicus.*" Emmet's dissertation has the honour of being reprinted and preserved among the choice articles there.[1]

The capital city of Scotland abounds in societies, composed mostly of the higher order of students, who meet for mutual improvement. Several of them are so well administered as to have acquired considerable property, and have become corporate bodies. The "Royal Medical" is one of these, in which memoirs are read and debated. Mr. Emmet was a conspicuous orator in these discussions. He was thought to be one of the best speakers, if not the very best. He was sufficiently esteemed to be chosen one of the four presidents. It was a regulation that a part of the discussion in the order of business should be in Latin, and

[1]Emmet was also a distinguished member of the Royal Physical Society, of which society he was one of the presiding officers and to which he delivered the discourse on their opening a new hall. He was president of the association for the Promotion of Natural History, another society connected with university.—Ed.

herein perhaps Mr. Emmet excelled every person who took the floor. His knowledge was various, his memory retentive, his ideas methodical, and his utterance impressive.

I believe I am correct in remarking, that the distinction and praise he obtained while yet at the university, operated upon me as incentives to industry, after a model so conspicuous and admired, with the hope of gaining similar rewards.

There was yet another society, called the "Speculative," to which he belonged, and over which he also became a presiding officer. The exercises here were of a different character from those of the others, inasmuch as they embraced almost every subject except physical, natural, and medical science. The whole extent of politics, metaphysics, economics, literature, and history were considered at the meetings.

Where he obtained his boyish education, in what particular seminary, and under what instructors, are matters of which I am not informed. It is sufficient for me to observe that, on the title-page of his dissertation at Edinburgh, he assumed the title of bachelor of arts from Trinity College in Dublin. After this preparatory course he came from Ireland, his native country, to Edinburgh, for completing his professional studies. His father was a physician, and held the place of archiater or court physician to his majesty for the kingdom of Ireland. It may readily be understood that his classical attainments should be mingled with medical beginnings. The Irish students frequent Edinburgh to a very considerable number.

Young Emmet had gained in this place as much rep-

utation as one of his years could attain. He was prepared to enter the world of business, and give counsel to the sick and disabled. And in this function he would probably have been able and successful; adorning from year to year a profession he had cultivated with extraordinary diligence and ardour.

Emmet's intimacy with Mackintosh did not cease with his sojourn at the university. When he had graduated in medicine, he proceeded to London to attend the hospitals. He renewed his acquaintance there with his fellow-student Mackintosh, and was cordially received by him.

Having visited the principal schools of medicine in Great Britain, he went on the Continent, accompanied by Mr. Knox, a son of Lord Northland, and travelled through Germany, France, and Italy, and returned to Ireland in 1789, the period of the lamented death of his elder brother.[1] Of him, Thomas Addis was accustomed to speak as "one of the foremost men in point of talent that Ireland ever produced."

The death of Temple Emmet changed the destiny of his brother. It is said that it was at his father's desire he relinquished his profession, and determined on going to the bar; but his own account to the friend in Ireland, the late William Murphy, in whom of all others he reposed the greatest trust, and with great reason for so

[1] T. A. Emmet received the intelligence of his brother's sudden death in Paris.

doing, referred the change to the advice of Mackintosh, on the occasion of his passing through London on his return to Ireland.

Mackintosh, in speaking of his companions and fellow-students at Edinburgh, makes mention of Hope, Clerk (Lord President of the Council), Malcolm Laing (the historian), Professor Wilde, Benjamin Constant, "a Swiss, of singular manners and powerful talents, and who made a transient appearance in the tempestuous atmosphere of the French revolution," and Thomas Emmet, "who soon after quitted physic for law, and became distinguished at the bar." There is a miserable affectation prevalent of under-rating the oratorical powers of eminent Irishmen, even such men as Burke, Grattan, and Curran, and of describing their highest flights of eloquence as appeals to the passions, in contradistinction to the cool, deliberate, argumentative appeals to the reason which distinguish the oratorical powers of Scotch and English speakers. Mackintosh says, "Emmet did not reason, but he was an eloquent declaimer, with the taste which may be called Irish, and which Grattan had then rendered so popular at Dublin. Wilde had no precision and no elegance; he copied too much the faults of Mr. Burke's manner."

There are men in America, eminent in the legal profession, and elevated to its highest honours, who are fully as competent as Sir James

Mackintosh to form a just opinion of oratorical merit, and the author has heard such men pronounce opinions highly favourable of Emmet's eloquence; and he never heard from them or from any body connected with jurisprudence in the American university, neither from its president, Dr. Duer, nor any other person acquainted with Emmet's efforts at the American bar "that he did not reason." On the contrary, the general opinion entertained in that country was, that Emmet was a very close and powerful reasoner.

In the strange revolution of time and events, when Mackintosh was in Scotland, in 1801, "Constant was a tribune in France, Hope was Lord Advocate of Scotland, and Emmet, his former companion, was then a prisoner under his control."

T. A. Emmet, shortly after his brother's death, went to London, read two years in the Temple, occasionally attended the courts at Westminster, and often spoke with pleasure of having heard Erskine plead at the beginning of his career. He returned to Dublin, and was admitted to the Irish bar in Michaelmas term, 1790. He was in his 26th year when he commenced the study of the law.

In January, 1791, shortly after his admission to the bar, T. A. Emmet married Jane, daugh-

ter of the Rev. John Patten of Clonmel by his marriage with Margaret Colville.[1]

The earliest notice I find of the efforts of T. A. Emmet at the bar is one of the proceedings instituted in the month of June, 1792, in the singular case of James Napper Tandy against the viceroy, the Earl of Westmoreland, the lord chancellor, the Right Hon. John Foster, and Arthur Wolfe, Timothy Dillon, and George O'Reilly, Esqrs. Matthew Dowling, the attorney of Tandy, had issued a subpœna against the lord lieutenant, and the singular question came on to be argued before the judges in the Court of Exchequer the 27th of June, "Whether any action, civil or criminal, can lie against a lord lieutenant of Ireland, pending his viceroyalty?"

These proceedings arose out of a proclamation, bearing the names of the lord lieutenant and some members of the privy council, offering a reward for the apprehension of Tandy.

The proceedings were instituted on the ground

[1] The Rev. John Patten of Annerville, near Clonmel, died in 1787. Margaret Colville, the wife of John Patten, deceased July the 2nd, 1787, mother of Jane, William, and John Patten, was born the 8th of September, 1735. Jane Patten was born the 16th of August, 1771; William Patten was born the 10th of August, 1772; and John Patten, the only surviving child, the 10th of June, 1774. The wife of T. A. Emmet was a niece of the late eminent merchant, Mr. Colville of Merchants'-quay, and a first cousin of Mr. W. C. Colville, a director of the Bank of Ireland.

that the official rank of the lord lieutenant was conferred by letters patent under the great seal of Great Britain; while the great seal of Ireland was the only one which could be recognised in any court of law in Ireland.

Those who advised the course of proceedings adopted in Tandy's action against the lord lieutenant and privy council were men of a time that was productive of boldness. The circumstances of Tandy's case are briefly these: He was secretary to the Dublin Society of United Irishmen. It became the object of the society to discover the views of the Defenders: he accordingly met a party of Defenders at Castle Bellingham, where he took the oath; he was informed against, a bill of indictment was privately prepared against him at the Louth assizes, the authorities expecting to take him on his way to Dublin, where he had shortly to stand his trial for libel. He was informed of his danger, however, at Dundalk, and soon after quitted the kingdom.

Previously to his departure, he had challenged Toler, the solicitor-general; and Toler, it is said, was content to waive his privilege as an officer of government; but finding that Tandy was dilatory in taking advantage of the readiness on his part which had been intimated to his opponent, he complained of the breach of privilege, and Tandy was summoned to the bar of the House

of Commons; a warrant was issued against him, and subsequently a proclamation was put forth, offering a reward for his apprehension. These were the grounds of the proceedings against the viceroy and his privy councillors.

The final hearing of the motion came on the 26th of November, 1792—the Hon. Simon Butler, T. A. Emmet, and Mr. M'Nally for the plaintiff Tandy. The result was what might be expected; and the case is not only remarkable for the question raised in it, but for the report of the speech of Emmet on this occasion, the first of his on record, and the one at greatest length of any that has reached us. In that speech there were sufficient indications of ability of the first order to justify the anxiety felt to take him from the bar, and to shelve such formidable talents on the bench.

The great object of those proceedings it was desirable to keep undiscovered in the preliminary steps; that object was to contest the validity of the lord lieutenant's patent, as having been granted under the great seal of England, instead of that of the chancellor of Ireland. The object, however, was disclosed to the crown lawyers, and Tandy's advocates were obliged to bring forward the main question prematurely.

Various efforts were made by the crown lawyers to obtain an admission from plaintiff's attorney and counsel of the object of those pro-

ceedings. Throughout the proceedings, prudence and professional skill as well as abilities of a very high order were exhibited by the Hon. Simon Butler, one of the leading counsel for the plaintiff.

In the course of the proceedings the court addressed Mr. Tandy's counsel, Mr. Butler: "Would you, Mr. Butler, be understood to insinuate that there is no legal chief governor in this kingdom?"

Mr. Butler replied: "My lords, the regard I have for the peace of this kingdom obliges me to decline an answer to your lordship's question; but the conclusion can be readily drawn from the premises."

Mr. J. St. John Mason, who, be it remembered, was a first cousin and a very intimate and confidential friend of T. A. Emmet, has given me a written statement of his recollections of T. A. Emmet and his brothers, wherein I find the following account of the part taken by T. A. Emmet in the very remarkable proceedings in the King's Bench, J. N. Tandy *versus* John Fane, Earl of Westmoreland, in 1792:

> With respect to the proceedings in the King's Bench against the viceroy, Lord Westmoreland (on account of a proclamation which the latter in council had issued for the apprehension of J. N. Tandy, who had fled the country on the issuing of an order for his

arrest, in consequence of a report of a secret committee of the House of Commons, charging him with treasonable communication with the Defenders), the object was to contest the validity of the appointment of Lord Westmoreland as lord lieutenant, and indeed of all those who had previously filled the office of viceroy; and to produce the Earl of Westmoreland as a witness in those proceedings of Tandy, for the purpose of showing that his lordship's appointment was invalid, inasmuch as it was in virtue only of letters patent granted under the great seal of England, and not under the great seal of Ireland, which was then a separate kingdom. On that occasion, a subpœna having been issued for the attendance, as a witness, of Lord Westmoreland, T. A. Emmet moved for the plaintiff that the defendant, John Fane, Earl of Westmoreland, of the kingdom of Great Britain, do enter into security for his appearance at court on the first day of next term. The court refused the motion. The attorney-general declared that the lord lieutenant would not give security. The Hon. Simon Butler, for the plaintiff, said he trusted that Lord Westmoreland would give security, if the court was pleased to order him to do so. But the hearing of the arguments on the question, whether any action, civil or criminal, can lie against a lord lieutenant of Ireland, pending his viceroyalty, was postponed to the following term. In the meantime the great object of plaintiff's counsel had been defeated by the disclosure of their main object (which they believed the government ignored) in instituting these proceedings—namely, to raise the question of the validity of the appointment of the lord lieutenant.

The plaintiff's attorney, Matthew Dowling, had been examined by the defendant's counsel on the subject of the object of these proceedings, and had, by Mr. Butler's direction, refused to answer any questions as to that object.

On the renewed proceedings in this case, 26th November, 1792, T. A. Emmet spoke strongly on the subject of the lord lieutenant's appointment. One passage created a sensation throughout the kingdom: "I boldly assert that there has been no legal viceroy in Ireland for the last six hundred years, and not only the counsel for Lord Westmoreland will not deny that fact, but they will not dare to let his patent come under a train of legal investigation."

And Mr. Mason, after citing this passage, observes: "Leonard M'Nally, the barrister, betrayed the cause by disclosing the object to the government, or the judges, or legal advisers of the crown, who had all been previously ignorant of it."

I take it, what Mr. Mason meant to say was, that Mr. M'Nally was the person suspected by Tandy's counsel of being the betrayer of their secrets in this instance.

It should be borne in mind that when Thomas Addis Emmet took the part and delivered the speech which he did on this occasion, he had only been at the bar about a year and a half, having been called to it at the term of 1790.

With respect to the betrayal of the secret of

Tandy's counsel to the crown lawyers (whosoever the betrayer was), the importance of the disclosure was manifest in the urgency of the application of the attorney-general to quash the proceedings *in limine;* an application which, at the early stage of the proceedings, so embarrassed Tandy's counsel as to defeat their plans.

In the report of those proceedings I find Mr. Leonard M'Nally, whom Mr. Mason charges with picking the brains of the leading counsel in this case (as in later times he has been charged with picking the brains of his clients, pleading speciously in the case he was supposed to advocate sincerely), represented as following up vigorously the course taken in support of the motion of Mr. Butler. The report says: "Mr. M'Nally, one of Mr. Tandy's counsel, strongly seconded Mr. Butler's efforts."

The next account met with of Emmet's practice at the Irish Bar, is at the assizes of Tralee, April, 1793, at the trial of Lieut. Carr, of the 40th regiment, for the murder of a Mr. O'Connell, who had been shot in a duel by the prisoner. Emmet was the counsel for the latter, and showed great skill and judgment in his defence. See "Erskine's Magazine" for April, 1793. In September, 1793, at the Cork assizes, T. A. Emmet and the Sheares were associated with M'Nally in the defence of a Mr. O'Driscoll, for a seditious libel: their client was acquitted.

Before the alteration in the constitution of the United Irish Society, in 1795, a case occurred before Prime Serjeant Fitzgerald, in which a conviction was obtained on a charge of administering the United Irishman's oath, then a capital offence. Emmet appeared for the prisoners on a motion in arrest of judgment. He took up the pleadings in which the words of the oath were recited, and he read them in a very deliberate manner, and with all the gravity of a man who felt that he was binding his soul by the obligations of a solemn oath. The words were to the following effect:

> I, A. B., in the presence of God, do pledge myself to my country, that I will use all my abilities and influence in the attainment of an impartial and adequate representation of the Irish nation in parliament; and as a means and absolute and immediate necessity in the establishment of this chief good of Ireland, I will endeavour, as much as lies in my ability, to forward a brotherhood of affection, an identity of interests, a communion of rights, and an union of power, among Irishmen of all religious persuasions, without which, every reform in parliament must be partial, not national, inadequate to the wants, delusive to the wishes, and insufficient to the freedom and happiness of this country.

Having read the test, and defended its obligations with a power of reasoning and a display of

legal knowledge, in reference to the subject of the distinction between legal and illegal oaths, which the counsel for the prosecution described as producing an extraordinary impression, he addressed the court in the following terms:

> My lords—here, in the presence of this legal court, this crowded auditory—in the presence of the Being that sees and witnesses and directs this judicial tribunal—here, my lords, I, myself, in the presence of God, declare I take the oath.

He then took the book that was on the table, kissed it, and sat down. No steps were taken by the court against the newly-sworn United Irishman: the amazement of its functionaries left them in no fit state of mind either for remonstrance or reproval. The prisoners received a very lenient sentence.

The only speech of T. A. Emmet reported at length, on the trials of the United Irishmen in which he was professionally engaged, was in the case of twelve prisoners who had been imprisoned nearly seven months in the artillery barracks of Belfast, and were brought up by *Habeas Corpus,* directed to General Lake and Colonel Barber, before the Court of King's Bench, the 10th of October, 1797.

It was on very rare occasions that T. A. Emmet appeared as counsel for the United

Irishmen at the trials of 1797 and 1798. An understanding had been entered into with their leaders that he should take no prominent part in their behalf, from the time that he became intimately connected with their proceedings in 1796. He acted in the capacity of chamber lawyer to their committees, and there were few events of importance to their interests on which he was not consulted by them. Such was his position in relation to the Society at the period when he became a member of it, in 1796. It is necessary now to inquire into the views and prospects of the Society at the date of his connection with it.

James Napper Tandy

First Secretary, and One of the Founders of the United Irishmen of Dublin. After a Painting by Petric, now in the Family Gallery, Johnsbrook, Ireland

CHAPTER IV

CONNECTION WITH THE UNITED IRISHMEN

IN men who are "fit for treasons, stratagems, and broils," the passions and mental qualities we expect to find are ambition, vanity, malignity, restlessness, or recklessness of mind. Were these the characteristics of T. A. Emmet? The question, with perfect safety to the memory of Emmet, might be put to any surviving political opponent of his of common honesty, who was acquainted with those times, and the men who were prominent actors in them. Emmet's ambition was to see his country well governed, and its people treated like human beings, destined and capacitated for the enjoyment of civil and religious freedom. For himself he sought no pre-eminence, no popular applause; he shrunk from observation where his merits, in spite of his retiring habits, forced themselves into notice. No man could say that Emmet was ambitious.

Emmet's vanity was of a peculiar kind; he was vain of nothing but his name: it was associated with the brightest of the by-gone hopes of Irish genius, and with the fairest promises of the revival of the latter in the dawning powers of a singularly gifted brother. No man could say

with truth that vanity or selfishness was the mental infirmity of Emmet.

No malignant act was ever imputed to him. The natural kindness of his disposition was manifested in his looks, in his tone of voice; those who came in contact with him felt that his benignity of disposition, his purity of heart and mind were such, "and the elements so mixed in him, that nature might stand up and say to all the world—this was a man." Malignity and Emmet were as dissimilar in nature as in name.

A restless mind was not the mind of Emmet; the calm, tranquillizing influence of philosophy had given its serenity to his intellectual organization. The repose, if one may so speak, of his character was apparent in the composure of his demeanour and the quietude of his deportment; no man could say that Emmet, as Gregory of Nazianzen did of Julian, his fellow-student, "that he prognosticated evil of him from the restlessness of his regard, the wandering of his eyes, and the unsteadiness of his nature."

The charge of recklessness or unscrupulousness of conduct never has been brought against Emmet. Then, under what circumstances, or impelled by what motive, did such a person become a rebel?—a man of a moderate independence, of rising prospects at the bar (in the first year of his practice he realized £700, I learn from Mr. J. St. John Mason), devoted to his

family—his chief happiness in its circle—of domestic habits, of irreproachable character; who had "given hostages to fortune," and had a father's interest in the preservation of peace and quiet; who had a stake in the soil, and being connected with it by other ties besides those of love, was necessarily opposed to measures which perilled property and the privileges of its owners. If the reader would know the cause, he will find it in every page of Irish history that is devoted to the illustration of this period of it, and it may be comprised in a single sentence: The cruel policy of ruling the country by means of the disunion of the inhabitants, and the abandonment of the power and functions of government to a faction, whose interests and passions were arrayed in deadly hostility against the great body of the people.

In the winter of 1790, Tone instituted a kind of political club, consisting of Drennan, Stokes, Pollock, Johnson, Burrowes, Stack, and Russell. Any two of the men present would have been the delight and entertainment of a well-chosen society; but all together was, as Wolsey says, "too much honour." Tone adds: "In recording the names of the members of the club, I find I have strangely omitted the name of a man whom, as well for his talents as his principles, I esteem as much as any, far more than most of them, I mean Thomas Addis Emmet, a barris-

ter. He is a man completely after my own heart; of a great and comprehensive mind; of the warmest and sincerest affection for his friends; and of a firm and steady adherence to his principles, to which he has sacrificed much, as I know, and would, I am sure, if necessary, sacrifice his life. His opinions and mine square exactly."

The first mention made of Emmet's taking any active part in politics is in Tone's Journal, where Emmet's introduction to the sub-committee of the Roman Catholics, the 15th October, 1792, is recorded. Tone states that he was well received by the members, and "richly deserved their admiration." "He was the best of all the friends to Catholic emancipation, always excepting Mr. Hutton" (himself). From this time Emmet, behind the scenes of Catholic agitation, continued to give his pen to their cause; and, with his usual heedlessness of self, allowed others to take the merit of his services.

The grand juries throughout the country, in the spring and summer of 1792, had published resolutions expressive of their readiness to give "life and property" in defence of the principles of Protestant ascendancy. These were replied to in the name of the sub-committee of the Catholics, and the writers of these replies were two Protestant barristers, Messrs. Tone and Emmet. "At work with Emmet on the reply to the grand

juries, 23rd October." The address of the sub-committee to the Dublin corporation, at the same period, was also written by Emmet: this paper, which Tone calls a most excellent one, met the unanimous approbation of a meeting of the parochial delegates.

Aggregate meetings of the Catholic body now became frequent, and every person of any note connected with them took a part in their proceedings. Emmet alone kept aloof: he rendered them all the assistance in his power—he devoted his fine talents to their service, but he made no public display, and sought no public approbation for them. At this time he was not a member of the Society of United Irishmen, but long before he joined it he was the person in every emergency consulted by its leaders. When Tone, in the spring of 1795, was about to quit the country for America, he and Russell had an interview with Emmet, at his country-seat at Rathfarnham.

The particulars of this interview have been already given; it is sufficient to recall the nature of it and the associations connected with it. The meeting took place in a little study which Emmet was building at the bottom of the lawn. He said "he would consecrate it to their meetings, if ever they lived to see their country emancipated."

The place where the conversation took place

was a little triangular field. Emmet remarked, "that it was in one like it in Switzerland where William Tell and his associates planned the downfall of the tyranny of Austria."[1]

On Tone's departure from Dublin to embark at Belfast, Thomas Addis Emmet addressed the following letter to him:

My dear Friend—I have just this instant heard from Simon M'Guire that you leave town to-night. I can scarcely believe that you would entirely break yourself away from this country, and from me among the rest, without calling on me or even writing a line. You know, and I trust will always be convinced that my friendship and affectionate regard for you is most undiminished. It is not of that nature to shake by adversity, which God knows how soon it may be my lot to undergo. Wherever you are you shall always command a steady friend in this country, as long as I reside here. Write to me at least when you reach your destination, and as often as may suit your convenience. Perhaps your letters may be useful to me for regulating my future settlement in life. God bless you. Give my most affectionate compliments to Mrs. Tone.

And believe me sincerely, &c.

The organization of the union was intended to be a complete representative system. It underwent two important changes. In 1794, the society, having been forcibly dissolved, became a

[1] Tone's Life, vol. i, p. 125.

secret one the beginning of 1795. Its objects extended far beyond reform and emancipation.

In 1796, the military organization was engrafted on the civil. All officers, to the rank of colonel, were elected by the committees: those of a higher grade by the executive; and with the concurrence of that body, the colonels had the nomination of an adjutant-general for each county. The commander-in-chief was nominated by the Leinster directory, and that officer was Lord Edward Fitzgerald.

A military committee was also appointed in 1798 by the same body, to prepare plans and communicate with the various societies on military subjects. The Leinster directory estimated the total of the United Irishmen throughout the country at half a million; the effective strength that might be relied on to take the field, at three hundred thousand. Many of these details have been already given at some length, but it is desirable to recall them to comprehend the grounds on which the leaders relied for accomplishing their objects. The northern directory was first formed. Arthur O'Connor and Lord Edward Fitzgerald established the Leinster, and for some time were its only members. Bond, Macneven, M'Cormick, and Jackson, came in at a later period. Emmet, who had been a member of the society from 1796, became one of the directory in 1797. He had been previously solic-

ited to join it by Arthur O'Connor, and had declined; but on O'Connor's arrest and imprisonment in the Tower, about the middle of 1797, when the interests of the union were deprived of the services of its chief leader, he took his post.

O'Connor, immediately after his liberation, having been imprisoned for nearly six months, found it necessary to quit Ireland, and did not return till after the arrests of the leaders on the 12th of March, when he was brought back a prisoner after his trial at Maidstone; so that Emmet and he were not members of the directory at the same period. Each, however, had their circle of friends among the leaders, and in the directory the views of each were more or less influenced by them. It is a matter of notoriety, and needs no concealment, that the councils of the directory were distracted and divided on the most important of all questions to their cause—namely, the question of risking an attempt on their own resources, or deferring that attempt till the assistance they had demanded had been given to them. In favour of the former proceedings Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Arthur O'Connor, and Henry Jackson, not once or twice, but on several occasions, expressed their opinions strongly; while at various times Emmet, M'Cormick, and Macneven as strenuously opposed them. M'Cormick foresaw the issue of this division in their councils; he kept aloof from the society in the latter

part of 1797; he fled the kingdom in March, 1798. It is an easy matter after an event to pronounce judgment on the views of those whose efforts were directed in different ways to the accomplishment of the object, and were unsuccessful. The application to France had been made by the directory before Emmet joined it. That application was determined on at a meeting called about the middle of 1796, in consequence of a letter received from Tone, who was then in Paris, stating that the French government, on representations made to it, was favourably disposed towards the objects of the society.[1]

On this intimation an application for assistance was made to the directory, and a positive assurance was given that it would be granted.

Tone had no specific authority from the directory to make the representation above-mentioned, but his journals leave no doubt that the representation was made with the concurrence of persons not then prominent members of the directory; but, in point of rank and influence among the popular party, the foremost men in the country. The garden scene described by Tone in 1795 can leave no doubt of Emmet's concurrence in the views on which Tone acted. The letter of "one of the chief Catholic leaders" (John Keogh), made mention of in another part of the journal, dated 3rd September, 1795, is

[1] Memoirs of Emmet, O'Connor, and Macneven.

less explicit than the former; but the matter alluded to requires no ghost from the grave to divine its meaning.

> Remember, then, my dear Tone, the many hours we spent in the garden, in your favourite walk. That these conversations impress your mind, as they do mine, I can never doubt. . . . Once more, Tone, remember and execute your garden conversation.

There can be no longer any necessity for withholding the fact that Mr. Keogh, one of "the chief Catholic leaders," was a member of the Society of United Irishmen, as well as his friend Richard M'Cormick, the secretary of the Catholic Committee, and the gentleman who preceded him in that office, Theobald Wolfe Tone. We carefully discriminate between those who were fortunate enough to escape unscathed in the struggle, and those who went down to the grave branded with the name of traitors; but while these persons who were partakers of their sentiments, associates in their cause, but not sharers in their unhappy fate, who concurred in the projects, the execution of which brought ruin on the agents employed in carrying them into effect, are held entitled to the Spartan privilege of impunity, the memories of the others might claim at least some indulgent consideration on the part of those who speculated on successful in-

surrection—notwithstanding they skulked when the struggle came which they had precipitated, and showed no sympathy with those who failed.[1]

Not many months before the flight of M'Cormick, John Keogh was called on to preside at a very important meeting of the United Irishmen of the higher class of Dublin leaders, at the house of Mr. Cornelius M'Laughlin on Usher's-island. Keogh, on taking the chair, called for a list of the members who were to attend. After some time a gentleman, known to be an United Irishman, but whose name was not on the list, entered the room and took part in the proceedings. Keogh became uneasy; he beckoned to M'Cormick, and desired him to inquire why persons attended the meeting who had not been invited. The latter made an inquiry, and brought back word that the gentleman was the friend of one of those who had been invited, and was a very trustworthy person. Keogh was not satisfied. Another gentleman was brought in under

[1] Mr. John Keogh, long previously to 1798, did not escape the penalty which all prominence in political agitation has to pay to jealousy, envy, or supicion, for its notoriety and elevation. He was suspected of infidelity to the cause of the Catholics so early even as 1793, and in all probability was unjustly suspected on that occasion. A gentleman of undoubted veracity, the late Mr. William Murphy, informed me that he examined, at the desire of John Keogh, his books, while he was engaged in business, and found that in one year he had cleared £6,000, and that the landed property he had purchased, and which brought him in only £180 a-year when he bought it, was then bringing him £800 a-year. So much for his commercial gains.

similar circumstances. Keogh then whispered to M'Cormick, in the hearing of William Murphy, who sat next to the latter, "Dick, men's lives are not safe with fellows who would act in this manner." And in the course of a few minutes he pleaded an engagement and quitted the meeting, and from that time never attended at one, but continued for some time known to the chief men of the society as an attached friend to their cause.

The dependence on French assistance proved fatal to the union. This was the opinion of T. A. Emmet, communicated to his brother barrister, the distinguished Charles Glidden Haines, in 1812 (both attending the supreme court at Washington), when an outline of his early career and the progress of the struggle he had embarked in was given to that gentleman. Mr. Emmet informed him that, independently of the effective force they counted on in their society, a plan had been concerted to effect the important object of bringing a considerable number of British ships, chiefly manned by Irishmen, into the ports. From the opinions he expressed on this subject, Haines concluded that had Ireland never relied at all on France her prospects of success might have been better; the French, however, having once promised, it was reasonable to place reliance on that promise, and, as it turned out, the reliance thus placed embarrassed every-

thing. With respect to the conduct of Buonaparte towards the agents of the United Irishmen, Emmet denounced him as "the worst enemy Ireland ever had."

The government having allowed the plans of the United Irishmen to come to a sufficient degree of maturity for their purposes, availed themselves of the services of a man, whose very name sounds in one's ears like a serpent's hiss—Reynolds the informer.

The deputies were arrested on his information at Bond's, the 12th of March, 1798; Emmet, Macneven, Jackson, and Sweetman were taken the same day at their several abodes, brought to the Castle, examined there, and most of them committed to Newgate.

Emmet's arrest was made by Alderman Carleton, by whom he was conducted to the Castle. He was given in charge of Alderman Carleton, brought to his house, and remained there in surveillance for some days, and was then committed to Kilmainham.

A circumstance that ought not to be omitted has been mentioned to me by Emmet's second son Thomas, respecting the arrest of his father. He states that he remembers when his father was taken at the house in Stephen's-green. What impressed it on his memory was the circumstance of his being suddenly awoke, and his little brother also, who was sleeping with him, and

seeing a number of soldiers standing near the window with fixed bayonets presented at them. These military heroes must surely have been of some yeomanry corps; the regulars would have spared the nursery.

Against Emmet there was no specific charge —no overt act of treason brought against him. From the time of O'Connor's arrest he was looked upon as the prime mover in the conspiracy—the head-piece of the union—and in that opinion there was no mistake. There were twenty of the leaders, men of the union, from various parts of the country, particularly from the north, then confined in Newgate.

The wife of Emmet at that period had an opportunity afforded of displaying that heroic devotion to her husband which she was destined to be called on to exhibit for upwards of four years, in the several prisons he was immured in. Soon after his confinement she obtained permission to visit him. The cell in which he was confined was about twelve feet square. She managed to secrete herself in this wretched abode for some days, one of the turnkeys who had charge of Emmet's cell being privy to her concealment. Her husband shared his scanty allowance with her; and there a lady, bred in the lap of luxury, accustomed to all the accommodations that are possessed by one in her sphere in life, used to all the comforts of a happy home, familiarized

to the affectionate care and kind attentions of an amiable family, daily blessed with the smiling faces of her dear children—"one who had slept with full content about her bed, and never waked but to a joyful morning"—shared the dungeon of her husband; its gloom, its dreary walls, its narrow limits, its dismal aspect—things and subjects for contemplation which her imagination a few weeks before would have sickened at the thought of—were now endured as if they affected her not; her husband was there, and everything else in this world, except her fears for his safety and for separation from him, were forgotten; her acts said to him,

> Thou to me
> Art all things under heaven, all places thou.

The gaoler at length discovered that Mrs. Emmet was an inmate of her husband's cell. She was immediately ordered to quit the place; but to the astonishment of the officers of the prison, who were not accustomed to have their orders disobeyed, she told them "her mind was made up to remain with her husband, and she would not leave the prison." The gaoler, whom Emmet speaks of as "a man of unfeeling and ruffianly deportment," stood awe-stricken before a feeble, helpless creature, whom he had only to order one of his myrmidons to tear from the arms of her

husband, and his bidding would have been obeyed. The power of a brave-spirited woman seldom is put forth that it does not triumph; and when she exerts it on occasions of mighty moment to those who are dearer to her than life, it is difficult to understand how the display alone of the noble instincts of her nature seems to overcome the insolent energy of brute force, the sense of superior strength, and assertion of authority.

The gaoler retired; and Emmet was given to understand that orders had been given to the man by his superiors not to employ force, but the first time that Mrs. Emmet left the prison she was not to be permitted to return. No such opportunity for her exclusion was afforded by that lady. She continued to share her husband's captivity for upwards of twelve months. But once in that time she left the prison, and then only to visit her sick child, when she appealed to the wife of the gaoler, "as the mother of a family," to take pity on her wretchedness, struggling as she was between her duty to her husband and the yearnings of nature towards her sick child.

It cheers one to find that even such an appeal as this was not made in vain. At midnight this woman conducted Mrs. Emmet through the apartments of the gaoler to the street. The following night, after remaining with her child at the house of Dr. Emmet during the day, she re-

turned to the gaol, gained admittance by the same means, and was on the point of entering her husband's cell when one of the keepers discovered her, but too late to exclude her from the prison. From that time she availed herself no more of the same facility for leaving or entering the prison. During her absence the room had been visited by one of the keepers, not an unfrequent occurrence; the curtains had been drawn round the bed, some bundles of clothing placed under the coverlid, and the keeper was requested to tread lightly, as Mrs. Emmet was suffering from headache. Shortly after this occurrence Emmet and Macneven were removed to Kilmainham gaol, and Mrs. Emmet found means to gain access to her husband, and the authorities connived at her sojourn in his dungeon.

These details are given from the account received by the author from those most intimately connected with the family in another country, as well as one still surviving in his own.

CHAPTER V

COMPACT WITH THE GOVERNMENT

IN the pamphlet from which the succeeding report of Emmet's examination is taken, no account is given of the compact with government; but in Macneven's "Pieces of Irish History" a statement of it is given by him at considerable length. The original draft of a paper on this subject, unpublished, drawn up chiefly by Emmet, exists in the handwriting of himself, Sweetman, and Macneven, and as it differs in the mode of treating the matter as well as in style, and in some respects is more precise and simple in its details, it is inserted in this memoir of its principal author, and however fully the subject has been gone into, the importance of it to the character of Emmet would alone be a sufficient reason for its insertion. The opponents of these men have had the full fling of their pens and tongues against the characters, private as well as public, of the men of 1798. In common fairness we are bound to hear what they have to say in their own defence, or at least in extenuation of their errors. The Musgraves, the Duigenans, the Reynoldses even, have had their

hearing—justice demands one for them, and it is not for those who profess to love justice to refuse it.

The account of the compact of the state prisoners with the Irish government, taken from the original draft of that document in the handwriting of Thomas Addis Emmet, John Sweetman, and William James Macneven, was drawn up by them in France on their liberation from Fort George, and remained in the possession of John Sweetman. The following part of the statement is in the handwriting of Thomas A. Emmet:

We, the undersigned, until this day state prisoners and in close custody, feel that the first purpose to which we should apply our liberty is to give to the world a short account of a transaction which has been grossly misrepresented and falsified, but respecting which we have been compelled to silence for nearly the last three years. The transaction alluded to is the agreement entered into by us and other state prisoners with the Irish government, at the close of the month of July, 1798; and we take this step without hesitation, because it can in nowise injure any of our friends and former fellow-prisoners, we being among the last victims of perfidy and breach of faith.

From the event of the battles of Antrim and Ballinahinch, early in June, it was manifest that the northern insurrection had failed in consolidating itself. The severe battle of Vinegar-hill, on the 21st of the same month, led to its termination in Leinster; and the capit-

ulation of Ovidstown, on the 12th of July,[1] may be understood as the last public appearance in the field of any body capable of serving as a rallying point. In short, the insurrection, for every useful purpose that could be expected from it, was at an end; but blood still continued to flow—courts-martial, special commissions, and, above all, sanguinary Orangemen, now rendered doubly malevolent and revengeful from their recent terror, desolated the country, and devoted to death the most virtuous of our countrymen. These were lost to liberty, while she was gaining nothing by the sacrifice.

Such was the situation of affairs when the idea of entering into a compact with government was conceived by one of the undersigned, and communicated to the rest of us conjointly with the other prisoners confined in the Dublin prisons, by the terms of which compact it was intended that as much might be saved and as little given up as possible. It was the more urgently pressed upon our minds, and the more quickly matured, by the impending fate of two worthy men. Accordingly, on the 24th of July, the state prisoners began a negotiation with government, and an agreement was finally concluded, by the persons named by their fellow-prisoners, at the Castle of Dublin, and was finally ratified by the lord chancellor, Lord Castlereagh, and Mr. Cooke, three of the king's ministers. In no part of this paper were details or perfect accuracy deemed nec-

[1] The event preceding the massacre of the capitulated body of the United Irishmen, on the Rath of the Curragh of Kildare, by the command of Major General Sir James Duff, executed chiefly by the yeomanry cavalry of Captain Bagot, and the Fox-hunters' Corps, commanded by Lord Roden.

essary, because the ministers, and particularly Lord Castlereagh, frequently and solemnly declared that it should in every part be construed by government with the utmost liberality and good faith; and particularly the last clause was worded in this loose manner to comply with the express desire of the ministers, who insisted upon retaining to government the entire popularity of the measure; but it was clearly and expressly understood, and positively engaged, that every leading man not guilty of deliberate murder should be included in the agreement who should choose to avail himself of it, in as full and ample a manner as the contracting parties themselves, and that there should be a general amnesty, with the same exceptions, for the body of the people.

We entered into this agreement the more readily, because it appeared to us that by it the public cause lost nothing. We knew, from the different examinations of the state prisoners before the privy council, and from conversations with ministers, that government was already in possession of all the important knowledge which they could obtain from us. From whence they derived their information was not entirely known to us, but it is now manifest that Reynolds, M'Ginn, and Hughes—not to speak of the minor informers—had put them in possession of every material fact respecting the internal state of the union; and it was from particular circumstances well known to one of us, and entirely believed by the rest, that its external relations had been betrayed to the English cabinet, through the agency of a foreigner with whom we negotiated.

This was even so little disguised that, on the preceding 12th of March, the contents of a memoir which had been prepared by one of the undersigned at Hamburgh, and transmitted thence to Paris, were minutely detailed to him by Mr. Cooke. Nevertheless those with whom we negotiated seemed extremely anxious for our communications. Their reasons for this anxiety may have been many, but two particularly suggested themselves to our minds: they obviously wished to give proof to the enemies of an Irish republic and of Irish independence of the facts with which they were themselves well acquainted, while, at the same time, they concealed from the world their real sources of intelligence. Nor do we believe we are uncharitable in attributing to them the hope and wish of rendering unpopular and suspected men in whom the United Irishmen had been accustomed to place an almost unbounded confidence. The injurious consequences of government succeeding in both these objects were merely personal; and as they were no more, though they were revolting and hateful to the last degree, we did not hesitate to devote ourselves that we might make terms for our country.

What were these terms? That it should be rescued from civil and military execution; that a truce should be obtained for liberty, which she so much required. There was also another strongly impelling motive for entering into this agreement. If government, on the one hand, was desirous of rousing its dependents by a display of the vigorous and well-concerted measures that were taken for subverting its authority and shaking off the English yoke; so we, on the other hand,

were not less solicitous for the vindication of our cause in the eyes of the liberal, the enlightened, and patriotic. We perceived that in making a fair and candid development of those measures we should be enabled boldly to avow and justify the cause of Irish union, as being founded upon the purest principles of benevolence, and as aiming only at the liberation of Ireland. We felt that we could rescue our brotherhood from those foul imputations which had been industriously ascribed to it—the pursuit of the most unjust objects by means of the most flagitious crimes.

If our country has not actually benefited to the extent of our wishes and of our stipulations, let it be remembered that this has not been owing to the compact, but to the breach of the compact—the gross and flagrant breach of it, both as to the letter and spirit, in violation of every principle of plighted faith and honour.

Having been called upon to fulfil our part of the compact, a stop being put to all further trials and executions, a memoir was drawn up and signed by two of the undersigned, together with another of the body (they being selected by government for that purpose), and was presented to Mr. Cooke on the 4th of August. It was very hastily prepared in a prison, and of course not so complete and accurate as it might otherwise have been; but sufficiently so to draw from Mr. Cooke an acknowledgment that it was a complete fulfilment of the agreement; though he said the lord lieutenant wished to have it so altered as not to be a justification of the United Irishmen, which, he said, it manifestly was.

Upon the refusal to alter it, government thought proper to suppress it altogether, and adopted a plan which they had already found convenient for promulgating not the entire truth, but so much of the truth as accorded with their views, and whatever else they wished to have passed upon mankind under colour of authority for the truth. This was no other than examination before the secret committees of parliament. By these committees several of us were examined; and, to our astonishment, we soon after saw in the newspapers, and have since seen in printed reports of these committees, misrepresented and garbled, and, as far as relates to some of us, very untrue and fallacious statements of our testimony—even in some cases the very reverse of what was given. That no suspicion may attach to this assertion from its vagueness, such of us as were examined will, without delay, state the precise substance of our evidence on that occasion.

The Irish parliament thought fit, about the month of September in the same year, to pass an act to be founded expressly on this agreement. To the provisions of that law we do not think it worth while to allude, because their severity and injustice are lost in comparison with the enormous falsehood of its preamble. In answer to that we most distinctly and formally deny that any of us did ever publicly or privately, directly or indirectly, acknowledge crimes, retract opinions, or implore pardon, as is therein most falsely stated. A full and explicit declaration to this effect would have been made public at the time, had it not been prevented by a message from Lord Cornwallis, delivered to one of the subscribers, on the 12th of that

month. Notwithstanding we had expressly stipulated at the time of the negotiation for the entire liberty of publication, in case we should find our conduct or motives misrepresented, yet this perfidious and inhuman message threatened that such declaration would be considered as a breach of the agreement on our part, and in that case the executions in general should go on as formerly.

Thus was the truth stifled at the time; and we believe firmly that to prevent its publication has been one of the principal reasons why, in violation of the most solemn engagements, we were kept in close custody ever since, and transported from our native country against our consent.

We conceive that to ourselves, to our cause, and to our country, and to posterity, we owe this brief statement of facts, in which we have suppressed everything that is not of a nature strictly vindicatory; because our object in this publication is not to criminate but to defend. As to their truth we positively aver them, each for himself, as far as they fall within his knowledge, and we firmly believe the others to be the truth, and nothing but the truth.

The following part of the statement is in the handwriting of John Sweetman:

On the 12th of March, the deputies from several counties having met in Dublin, to deliberate upon some general measures for the union, were arrested in a body at Mr. Bond's, as were also many other of its principal agents, and put into a state of solitary confinement. Some of those persons were examined by the

privy council previous to their committal to prison; when it appeared beyond a possibility of doubt that the negotiations of the United Irishmen with France had been betrayed to the British government. On the 30th, the kingdom was officially declared in a state of rebellion, and put under martial law. A proclamation from the lord lieutenant had directed the military to use the most summary methods for repressing disturbances; and it was publicly notified by the commanders in some counties, that unless the people brought in their arms in ten days from the period of publication, large bodies of troops would be quartered on them, who should be licensed to live at free quarters, and that other severities would be exercised to enforce acquiescence. In the latter end of May, the United armed men of the county Kildare felt themselves obliged to take the field, and hostilities commenced between them and the king's forces on the 24th. About this time the counties of Wexford and Wicklow were generally up, and those of Down, Derry, Antrim, Carlow, and Meath were preparing to rise. The appeal to arms in these counties was attended with various success on both sides, and the military were invested with further powers by a proclamation, issued by the lord lieutenant and council, directing the generals to punish all attacks upon the king's forces, according to martial law, either by death or otherwise, as to them should seem expedient. For some time the people had the advantage in the field; but the defeat at New Ross on the 5th of June, at Antrim on the 7th, that of Arklow on the 9th, of Ballinahinch on the 12th, of Vinegar-hill on the 21st, and Kilconnell on the 26th, with the evac-

uation of Wexford, and some unsuccessful skirmishes which afterwards took place in the county of Wicklow, removed all hope of maintaining the contest for the present with any probability of success. In the interim troops were arriving from England, and several regiments of English militia had volunteered their services for Ireland. About the end of June, a proclamation was issued, promising pardon and protection to all persons, except the leaders, who should return to their allegiance and deliver up their arms, which, it was said, had a very general effect. A large body of the Kildare men had already surrendered to General Dundas, and on the 21st of July another party, with its leaders, capitulated with General Wilford. The king's troops, by this time, were victorious in every quarter; and the park of artillery which had been employed in the south had returned to the capital.

It was now upwards of two months since the war broke out, during which time no attempt had been made by the French to land a force upon the coast, nor was there any satisfactory account then received that such a design was in contemplation. The expedition of Buonaparte and the forces under his command were already ascertained to have some port of the Mediterranean for their object. No other diversion was made by the French to distract the British power during this period. Military tribunals, composed of officers, who in many instances, as it has been publicly admitted, had not exceeded the inconsiderate age of boyhood, were everywhere instituted, and a vast number of executions had been the consequence. The yeomen and soldiery, licensed to indulge their rancour and revenge,

were committing those atrocious cruelties which unfortunately distinguish the character of civil warfare. The shooting of innocent peasants at their work was occasionally resorted to by them as a species of recreation —a practice so inhuman that unless we had incontestible evidence of the fact we never should have given it the slightest credibility. During these transactions a special commission, under an act of parliament, and passed for the occasion, was sitting in the capital; and the trials having commenced, it was declared from the bench that to be proved an United Irishman was sufficient to subject the party to the penalty of death, and that any member of a baronial or other committee was accountable for every act done by the body to which he respectively belonged in its collective capacity, whether it was done without his cognizance in his absence, or even at the extremity of the land. As it was openly avowed that convictions would be sought for only through the medium of informers, the government used every influence to dignify the character of this wretched class of beings in the eyes of those who were selected to decide on the lives of the accused; and they so effectually succeeded as to secure implicit respect to whatever any of them chose to swear, from juries so appointed, so prepossessed. It was made a point by the first connections of government to flatter those wretches, and some peers of the realm were known to have hailed the arch-apostate Reynolds with the title of "Saviour of his country."

The following part of the statement is in the handwriting of William James Macneven:

In the case of Mr. Bond, the jury, with an indecent precipitation, returned a verdict of guilty on the 23rd of July, and on the 25th he was sentenced to die. Byrne was also ordered for execution. In this situation of our affairs a negotiation was opened with government, and proceeded in through the medium of Mr. Dobbs. An agreement was in consequence concluded and signed, which among other things stipulated for the lives of Byrne and Bond; but government thought fit to annul this by the execution of Byrne. As, however, the main object, the putting a stop to the useless effusion of blood, was still attainable, it was deemed right to open a second negotiation. In its progress government having insisted on some dishonourable requisitions, which were rejected with indignation, occasioned the failure of this also. It was however proposed by them to renew it again, and deputies from the gaols were appointed to confer with the official servants of the crown. A meeting accordingly took place at the Castle on the 29th of July, when the final agreement was concluded and exchanged.

In addition to the fulfilment to the letter of this agreement, the official servants of the crown pledged the faith of government for two things—one that the result and end of that measure should be the putting a stop to the effusion of blood, and that all executions should cease, except in cases of wilful murder; the other was that the conditions of the agreement should be liberally interpreted. The agreement was, in the course of a day or two, generally signed by the prisoners.

Having thus stated the facts, we proceed to declare our reasons for entering into and ratifying this agree-

ment: 1st. Because we had seen, with great affliction, that in the course of the appeal to arms, while four or five counties out of the thirty-two were making head against the whole of the king's forces, no effectual disposition was manifested to assist them, owing, as we believe, to the extreme difficulty of assembling, and the want of authentic information as to the real state of affairs. 2ndly. Because the concurring or quiescent spirit of the English people enabled their government to send not only a considerable additional regular force, but also many regiments of English militia into Ireland. 3rdly. Because it was evident that in many instances the want of military knowledge in the leaders had rendered the signal valour of the people fruitless. 4thly. Because, notwithstanding it was well known in France that the revolution had commenced in Ireland—an event that they were previously taught to expect—no attempt whatever was made by them to land any force during the two months which the contest had lasted, nor was any account received that it was their intention even shortly to do so. 5thly. Because that by the arrest of many of the deputies and chief agents of the union, and by the absence of others, the funds necessary for the undertaking were obstructed or uncollected, and hence arose insurmountable difficulties. 6thly. Because, from the several defeats at New Ross and Wexford, no doubt remained on our minds that farther resistance, for the present, was not only vain but nearly abandoned. 7thly. Because we were well assured that the proclamation of amnesty issued on the 29th June had caused great numbers to surrender their arms and take the oath of

allegiance. 8thly. Because juries were so packed, justice so perverted, and the testimony of the basest informers so respected, that trial was but a mockery, and arraignment but the tocsin for execution. 9thly. Because we were convinced by the official servants of the crown, and by the evidence given on the trials, that government was already in possession of our external and internal transactions; the former they obtained, as we believe, through the perfidy of some agents of the French government at Hamburgh; the latter through informers who had been less or more confidential in all our affairs. 10thly, and finally. Every day accounts of the murders of our most virtuous and energetic countrymen assailed our ears; many were perishing on the scaffold, under pretext of martial or other law, but many more the victims of individual Orange hatred and revenge. To stop this torrent of calamity, to preserve to Ireland her best blood . . . we determined to make a sacrifice of no trivial value—we agreed to abandon our country, our families, and our friends.

And now we feel ourselves further called upon to declare that an Act, passed in Ireland during the autumn of 1798, reciting our names and asserting that we had "retracted our opinions, acknowledged our crimes, and implored pardon," is founded upon a gross and flagrant calumny—neither we, the undersigned, nor any of our fellow-prisoners, so far as we know or believe, having ever done either the one or the other; and we solemnly assert that we never were consulted about that Act, its provisions, or preamble, and that no copy of it was ever sent to us by any servant of the crown, though repeatedly promised by the under-

secretary, or by any other person. On the contrary it had, unknown to us, passed the House of Commons, when one of us (Samuel Neilson), having seen by mere accident an abstract of it in an English newspaper, remonstrated with the servants of the crown on the falsity of the preamble, and was silenced only by a message from the lord lieutenant, that it was his positive determination to annul the agreement and *proceed with the executions*, &c., if any further notice whatever was taken of the preamble, or if one word was published on the subject. We did not conceive ourselves warranted, situated as things then were, in being instrumental to a renewal of bloodshed. We have ever since been constrained to silence, for, in violation of a solemn agreement, we have been kept *close prisoners*.

To our country and to posterity we felt that we owed this declaration; and to their judgment upon our conduct and motives we bow with respectful submission.

In the month of July, 1798, the negotiations were entered into with the government, of which principal details have been given in the preceding memoir. On the 10th of August, T. A. Emmet was examined before the secret committee of the House of Lords. A very small portion of this examination was given in the parliamentary report purporting to contain the examinations of the state prisoners. On their liberation from Fort George, Emmet, O'Connor, and Macneven published in London a pamphlet containing the memoir of the origin and progress

of the union they had delivered to the Irish government, and an account of their examinations in which the suppressed portions of their evidence were given.[1] The pamphlet is now rarely to be met with, and from it the following account of the examination of T. A. Emmet is taken, after having compared it with the original document in the possession of the son of one of the parties to the compact.

SUBSTANCE OF THOMAS ADDIS EMMET'S EXAMINATION BEFORE THE SECRET COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS, ON FRIDAY, 10TH AUGUST, 1798.

Committee.—Were you an United Irishman?

Emmet.—My lords, I am one.

Com.—Were you a member of the executive?

Emmet.—I was of the executive from the month of January to the month of May, 1797, and afterwards from December, 1797, till I was arrested.

[I was then asked as to the military organization, which I detailed. They then asked when the returns included fire-arms and ammunition.]

Emmet.—After the Insurrection and Indemnity Acts had been passed, when the people were led to think on resistance, and after 4,000 persons had been driven from the county of Armagh by the Orangemen.

Com.—Was not the name of Orangemen used to terrify the people into the United system?

[1] "Memoirs of the Irish Union," &c. London: Robinson, 1802.

Emmet.—I do not know what groundless fears may have been propagated by ignorant people; but I am sure no unfair advantage was taken by the executive. The Orange principles were fairly discussed, as far as they were known, and we always found that wherever it was attempted to establish a lodge the United Irish increased very much.

Lord Dillon.—Why, where was it endeavoured to introduce them, except in the north and the city of Dublin?

Emmet.—My lord, I cannot tell you all the places in which it was endeavoured, but I will name one in the county of Roscommon, where I am told it made many United Irishmen.

Lord Dillon.—Well, that was but very lately, and I endeavoured to resist it.

Com.—When were the first communications with France?

Emmet.—The first I heard of were after the Insurrection and Indemnity Acts had been carried; the first I knew of was after the French fleet had left Bantry Bay, and after it was manifest the effort for reform would not succeed; and permit me to add, on my oath, it was my intention to propose to, and from conversations I had with some of the executive directory, I am sure it would have been carried there, that if there had been any reasonable hope of reform being adopted, to send one more messenger to France, and he should have told them the difference between the people and the government was adjusted, and not to attempt a second invasion. [They then took me into detail through the whole of the negotiations and messages—

stated that the demand on our part was from five to ten thousand men, and 40,000 stand of arms by the first agent; that the instructions to the second agent differed by requesting more arms in consequence of the disarming of the north which had intervened; and that the French had promised we should be at perfect liberty to choose our own form of government. It was expressly stipulated with them that they should conduct themselves so.]

Lord Chancellor.—As they did in Holland?

Emmet.—As Rochambeau did in America, my lords.

[They then entered on the subject of the separation.]

Lord Chancellor.—How is it possible, Mr. Emmet—just look on the map, and tell me how you can suppose that Ireland could exist independent of England or France?

Emmet.—My lords, if I had any doubt on that subject, I should have never attempted to effect a separation; but I have given it as much consideration as my faculties would permit, and I have not a shadow of doubt that if Ireland was once independent she might defy the combined efforts of France and England.

Archbishop of Cashel.—My God! her trade would be destroyed.

Emmet.—Pardon me, my lord, her trade would be infinitely increased: 150 years ago, when Ireland contained not more than one million and a half of men, and America was nothing, the connection might be said to be necessary to Ireland; but now that she contains five millions, and America is the best market in the world, and Ireland the best situated country in Europe

to trade with that market, she has outgrown the connection.

Lord Chancellor.—Yes; I remember talking to a gentleman of your acquaintance, and I believe one of your body and way of thinking, who told me that Ireland had nothing to complain of from England, but that she was strong enough to set up for herself.

Emmet.—I beg, my lords, that may not be considered as my opinion: I think Ireland has a great many things to complain of against England; I am sure she is strong enough to set up for herself; and give me leave to tell you, my lords, that if the government of this country be not regulated so as that the control may be wholly Irish, and that the commercial arrangements between the two countries be not put on the footing of perfect equality, the connection cannot last.

Lord Chancellor.—What would you do for coals?

Emmet.—In every revolution, and in every war, the people must submit to some privations; but I must observe to your lordships, that there is a reciprocity between the buyer and seller, and that England would suffer as much as Ireland if we did not buy her coals. However, I will grant our fuel would become dearer for a time, but by paying a higher price we could have a full and sufficient abundance from our own coal mines, and from bogs, by means of our canals.

Archbishop of Cashel.—Why, twelve frigates would stop up all our ports.

Emmet.—My lord, you must have taken a very imperfect survey of the ports on the western coasts of this kingdom, if you suppose that twelve frigates would block them up; and I must observe to you, that if

Ireland was for three months separated from England the latter would cease to be such a formidable naval power.

Lord Chancellor.—Well, I cannot conceive the separation could last twelve hours.

Emmet.—I declare it to God, I think that if Ireland were separated from England she would be the happiest spot on the face of the globe.

At which they all seemed astonished.

Lord Chancellor.—But how could you rely on France that she would keep her promise of not interfering with your government?

Emmet.—My reliance, my lords, was more on Irish power than on French promises, for I was convinced that, though she could not easily set up the standard herself, yet, when it was once raised, a very powerful army would flock to it, which, organized under its own officers, would have no reason to dread 100,000 Frenchmen; and we only stipulated for a tenth part of that number.

Lord Kilwarden.—You seem averse to insurrection; I suppose it was because you thought it impolitic?

Emmet.—Unquestionably; for if I imagined an insurrection could have succeeded without a great waste of blood and time, I should have preferred it to invasion, as it would not have exposed us to the chance of contributions being required by a foreign force; but as I did not think so, and as I was certain an invasion would succeed speedily, and without much struggle, I preferred it even at the hazard of that inconvenience, which we took every pains to prevent.

Lord Dillon.—Mr. Emmet, you have stated the views

of the executive to be very liberal and very enlightened, and I believe yours were so; but let me ask you whether it was not intended to cut off, in the beginning of the contest, the leaders of the opposition party by a summary mode, such as assassination? my reason for asking you is, John Sheares's proclamation, the most terrible paper that ever appeared in any country: it says, that "many of your tyrants have bled, and others must bleed," &c.

Emmet.—My lords, as to Mr. Sheares's proclamation, he was not of the executive when I was.

Lord Chancellor.—He was of the new executive.

Emmet.—I do not know he was of any executive, except from what your lordship says; but I believe he was joined with some others in framing a particular plan of insurrection for Dublin and its neighbourhood; neither do I know what value he annexed to those words in his proclamation: but I can answer that while I was of the executive there was no such design, but the contrary, for we conceived when one of you lost your lives we lost a hostage. Our intention was to seize you all, and keep you as hostages for the conduct of England, and after the revolution was over, if you could not live under the new government, to send you out of the country. I will add one thing more, which, though it is not an answer to your question, you may have a curiosity to hear. In such a struggle, it was natural to expect confiscations; our intention was, that every wife who had not instigated her husband to resistance should be provided for out of the property, notwithstanding confiscations, and every child who was too young to be his own master, or form his own opin-

ion, was to have a child's portion. Your lordships will now judge how far we intended to be cruel.

Lord Chancellor.—Pray, Mr. Emmet, what caused the late insurrection?

Emmet.—The free quarters, the house burnings, the tortures, and the military executions in the counties of Kildare, Carlow, and Wicklow.

Lord Chancellor.—Don't you think the arrests of the 12th of March caused it?

Emmet.—No; but I believe if it had not been for these arrests it would not have taken place; for the people, irritated by what they suffered, had been long pressing the executive to consent to an insurrection, but they had resisted or eluded it, and even determined to persevere in the same line; after these arrests, however, other persons came forward, who were irritated, and thought differently, who consented to let that partial insurrection take place.

Lord Chancellor.—Were all the executive arrested or put to flight by the arrests of the 12th of March?

Emmet.—Your lordships will excuse my answering to that question, as it would point out individuals.

Lord Chancellor.—Did you not think the government very foolish to let you proceed so long as they did?

Emmet.—No, my lord; whatever I imputed to government, I did not accuse them of folly. I knew we were very attentively watched, but I thought they were right in letting us proceed. I have often said, laughing, among ourselves, that if they did right they would pay us for conducting the revolution; conceiving, as I then did, and still do, that a revolution is inevitable,

unless speedily prevented by very large measures of conciliation. It seemed to me an object with them that it should be conducted by moderate men, of good moral characters, liberal education, and some talents, rather than by intemperate men, of bad characters, ignorant and foolish; and into the hands of one or other of those classes it undoubtedly will fall. I also imagined the members of government might be sensible of the difference between the change of their situation being affected by a sudden and violent convulsion, or by the more gradual measures of a well conducted revolution, if it were effected suddenly by an insurrection; and I need not tell your lordships that had there been a general plan of acting, and the north had coöperated with Leinster, the last insurrection would have infallibly and rapidly succeeded: in such case you would be tumbled at once from your pinnacle; but if a revolution were gradually accomplished, you would have had time to accommodate and habituate yourself to your situation. For these reasons I imagined government did not wish to irritate and push things forward.

Lord Chancellor.—Pray, do you think Catholic emancipation and parliamentary reform any objects with the common people?

Emmet.—As to Catholic emancipation, I do not think it matters a feather, or that the poor think of it. As to parliamentary reform, I do not think the common people ever thought of it, until it was inculcated into them that a reform would cause a removal of those grievances which they actually do feel. From that time I believe they have become very much attached to the measure.

Lord Chancellor.—And do you think that idea has been successfully inculcated into the common people?

Emmet.—It has not been my fortune to communicate much with them on that subject, so that I cannot undertake to say how far it has been successfully inculcated into them; but of this I am certain, that since the establishment of the United Irish system it has been inculcated into all the middling classes, and much more among the common people than ever it was before.

Lord Chancellor.—And what grievances would such a reformed legislature remove?

Emmet.—In the first place it would cause a complete abolition of tithes; in the next, by giving the common people an increased value in the democracy, it would better their situation, and make them more respected by their superiors; the condition of the poor would be ameliorated; and what is perhaps of more consequence than all the rest, a system of national education would be established.

Lord Dillon.—The abolition of tithes would be a very good thing; but do not you think it would be more beneficial to the landlords than the tenants?

Archbishop of Cashel.—Ay, it is they would benefit by it.

Emmet.—My lords, I am ready to grant that if tithes were now abolished without a reform, there are landlords who would raise the rent on their tenants, when they were making new leases, the full value of the tithes, and if they could more; but if a reform succeeded the abolition of tithes, such a reformed legislature would very badly know or very badly perform its

duty, if it did not establish such a system of landed leases as would prevent landlords from doing so; and let me tell your lordships, that if a revolution ever takes place, a very different system of political economy will be established from what has hitherto prevailed here.

Lord Glentworth,—Then your intention was to destroy the Church?

Emmet.—Pardon me, my lord, my intention never was to destroy the Church. My wish decidedly was to overturn the Establishment.

Lord Dillon.—I understand you—and have it as it is in France?

Emmet.—As it is in many parts of America, my lords.

Lord Kilwarden.—Pray, Mr. Emmet, do you know of any communications with France since your arrest?

Emmet.—I do, my lord; Mr. Cooke told me of one.

Lord Kilwarden.—But do not you in any other way know whether communications are still going on between this country and France?

Emmet.—No; but I have no doubt that even after we shall have left this country there will remain, among the 500,000 and upwards which compose the union, many persons of sufficient talents, enterprise, enthusiasm, and opportunity, who will continue the old, or open a new communication with France, if it shall be necessary; and in looking over, in my own mind, the persons whom I know of most talents and enterprise, I cannot help suggesting to myself persons I think most likely to do so; but I must be excused from pointing at them. THOMAS ADDIS EMMET.

N.B.—I have only noted down such questions and answers as I imagine will not be inserted in the reports of the secret committee.

SECOND EXAMINATION OF THOMAS ADDIS EMMET: BEFORE THE SECRET COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, 14TH AUGUST, 1798.

Lord Castlereagh mentioned that the minutes of my examination before the lords had been transmitted to them, and that they only wanted to ask me a few questions in explanation of those minutes. The general turn of the examination was therefore the same as that before the upper house; but I could observe much more manifestly this time than before a design, out of my answers to draw the conclusion that nothing would content the people but such changes as would be a departure from what they chose to call the English constitution and the English system; and therefore I presume they meant to infer that the popular claims must be resisted at all hazards. The Speaker seemed to me to take the lead in conducting the investigation of this point.

Lord Castlereagh.—Mr. Emmet, you said in your examination before the lords that the French had not made known the place where they intended landing; how then will you explain an address which we have here, stating that the French were shortly expected in Bantry Bay?

Emmet.—My lord, I know nothing at present of that address, but I suppose on farther inquiry it will be found to be some mistake, as I am positive they never mentioned Bantry Bay in any communication. I

knew, on the contrary, Galway Bay was looked on as the probable place of their landing.

N.B.—I find, upon inquiry, that address is without a date, and was written after the French had disappeared from Bantry Bay, and were generally expected to return.

Mr. Alexander.—I have here some resolutions [which he read, and which among other things spoke of the extent of the confiscations that would be made in the event of a revolution, and how they should be applied], do you know anything of them?

Emmet.—I have a recollection of having read them before; and if that recollection be right, they are resolutions that have been passed by an individual society at Belfast, and were seized at the arrests of Barrett, Burnside, and others.

Mr. Alexander.—They are the same.

Emmet.—Then I hope the committee will draw no inference from them as to the views of the executive, or of the whole body. You know the north well, and that every man there turns his mind more or less on speculative politics; but certainly the opinion of a few of the least informed among them cannot be considered as influencing the whole.

Mr. J. C. Beresford.—Ay, but would you be able to make such people give up their own opinion to follow yours?

Emmet.—I am convinced we should; because I know we have done it before on points where their opinions and wishes were very strong.

Mr. Alexander.—How did you hope to hold the

people in order and good conduct when the reins of government were loosened?

Emmet.—By other equally powerful reins. It was for this purpose I considered the promoting of organization to be a moral duty. Having no doubt that a revolution would and will take place, unless prevented by removing the national grievances, I saw in the organization the only way of preventing its being such as would give the nation lasting causes of grief and shame. Whether there be organization or not, the revolution will take place; but if the people be classed and arranged for the purpose, the control which heads of their own appointment will have over them, by means of the different degrees of representation and organs of communication, will, I hope, prevent them from committing those acts of outrage and cruelty which may be expected from a justly irritated but ignorant and uncontrolled populace.

Mr. Alexander.—But do you think there were in the union such organs of communication as had an influence over the lower orders, and were at the same time fit to communicate and do business with persons of a better condition?

Emmet.—I am sure there were multitudes of extremely shrewd and sensible men, whose habits of living were with the lower orders, but who were perfectly well qualified for doing business with persons of any condition.

Speaker.—You say the number of United Irishmen is five hundred thousand—do you look upon them all as fighting men?

Emmet.—There are undoubtedly some old men and some young lads among them; but I am sure I speak within bounds when I say the number of fighting men in the union cannot be less than three hundred thousand.

Speaker.—I understand, according to you, the views of the United Irish went to a republic and separation from England, but that they would probably have compounded for a reform in parliament. Am I not right, however, to understand that the object next their hearts was a separation and a republic?

Emmet.—Pardon me, the object next their hearts was a redress of their grievances. Two modes of accomplishing that object presented themselves to their view; one was a reform by peaceable means, the other was a revolution and republic. I have no doubt that if they could flatter themselves that the object next their hearts would be accomplished peaceably, by a reform, they would prefer it infinitely to a revolution and republic, which must be more bloody in their operation; but I am also convinced, when they saw they could not accomplish the object next their hearts, a redress of their grievances, by a reform, they determined in despair to procure it by a revolution, which I am persuaded is inevitable, unless a reform be granted.

Speaker.—You say that a revolution is inevitable unless a reform be granted; what would be the consequence of such a reform in redressing what you call the grievances of the people?

Emmet.—In the first place I look to the abolition of tithes. I think such a reformed legislature would also

produce an amelioration of the state of the poor and a diminution of the rents of lands, would establish a system of national education, and would regulate the commercial intercourse between Great Britain and Ireland on the footing of perfect equality, and correct the bloody nature of your criminal code.

Speaker.—You speak of the abolition of tithes; do you include in that the destruction of the Establishment?

Emmet.—I have myself no doubt of the Establishment's being injurious, and I look to its destruction; but I cannot undertake to say how far the whole of that measure is contemplated by the body of the people, because I have frequently heard an acreable tax proposed as a substitute, which necessarily supposes the preservation of the Establishment.

Speaker.—Don't you think the Catholics peculiarly object to tithes?

Emmet.—They certainly have the best reason to complain, but I rather think they object as tenants more than as Catholics, and in common with the rest of the tenantry of the kingdom; and if any other way of paying even a Protestant Establishment, which did not bear so sensibly on their industry were to take place, I believe it would go a great way to content them, though I confess it would not content me; but I must add that I would (and I am sure so would many others who think of establishments like me) consent to give the present incumbents equivalent pensions.

Lord Castlereagh.—Don't you think the Catholics look to the accomplishing the destruction of the Establishment?

Emmet.—From the declaration they made in 1792 or 1793 I am sure they did not then. I cannot say how far their opinions may have altered since; but from many among them proposing a substitute for tithes I am led to believe they are not yet gone so far.

Lord Castlereagh.—But don't you think they will look to its destruction?

Emmet.—I cannot pay so bad a compliment to the reasons which have convinced myself, as not to suppose they will convince others. As the human mind grows philosophic, it will I think wish for the destruction of all religious establishments; and therefore, in proportion as the Catholic mind becomes philosophic, it will of course entertain the same wishes; but I consider that as the result of its philosophy and not of its religion.

Lord Castlereagh.—Don't you think the Catholics would wish to set up a Catholic Establishment in lieu of the Protestant one?

Emmet.—Indeed I don't, even at the present day; perhaps some old priests, who have long groaned under the penal laws, might wish for a retribution to themselves, but I don't think the young priests would wish for it, and I am convinced the laity would not submit to it, and that the objections to it will be every day gaining strength.

Speaker.—You also mention that a reform would diminish the rents of lands; how do you think that would be done?

Emmet.—I am convinced rack rents can only take place in a country otherwise essentially oppressed. If the value of the people was raised in the state, their importance would induce the landlords to consult their

interests, and therefore to better their condition. Thus I think it would take place, even without any law bearing upon the matter.

Mr. Alexander.—Mr. Emmet, you have gone circuit for many years; now have you not observed that the condition of the people has been gradually bettering?

Emmet.—Admitting that the face of the country has assumed a better appearance—if you attribute it to the operation of any laws you have passed, I must only declare my opinion, it is *post hoc sed non ex hoc.* As far as the situation of the lower orders may have been bettered in Ireland, it results from the increased knowledge, commerce, and intercourse of the different states of Europe with one another, and is enjoyed in this country only in common with the rest of civilized Europe and America. I believe the lower orders in all those countries have been improved in their condition within these twenty years, but I doubt whether the poor of this kingdom have been bettered in a greater proportion than the poor in the despotic states of Germany.

Speaker.—You mention an improved system of national education; are there not as many schools in Ireland as in England?

Emmet.—I believe there are, and that there is in proportion as great a fund in Ireland as in England, if it were fairly applied; but there is this great difference—the schools are Protestant schools, which answer very well in England, but do little good among the Catholic peasantry of Ireland. Another thing to be considered is, that stronger measures are immediately necessary for educating the Irish people than are nec-

essary in England. In the latter country no steps were taken to counteract the progress of knowledge—it had fair play, and was gradually advancing; but in Ireland you have brutalized the vulgar mind by long-continued operation of the Popery laws, which, though they are repealed, have left an effect that will not cease these fifty years. It is incumbent then on you to counteract that effect by measures which are not equally necessary in England.

Speaker.—You mentioned the criminal code; in what does that differ from the English?

Emmet.—It seems to me that it would be more advisable, in reviewing our criminal law, to compare the crime with the punishment, than the Irish code with the English; there is, however, one difference that occurs to me on the instant—administering unlawful oaths is in Ireland punished with death.

Lord Castlereagh.—That is a law connected with the security of the state.

Emmet.—If it is intended to keep up the ferment of the public mind such laws may be necessary; but if it be intended to allay that ferment, they are perfectly useless.

Speaker.—Would putting the commercial intercourse on the footing of equality satisfy the people?

Emmet.—I think that equality of situations would go nearer satisfying the people than any of the other equalities that have been alluded to.

Speaker.—Then your opinion is, that we cannot avoid a revolution unless we abandon the English constitution and the English system in our Establishment, education, and criminal laws?

Emmet.—I have already touched on the latter subjects: as to the English constitution, I cannot conceive how a reform in parliament can be said to destroy that.

Speaker.—Why, in what does the representation differ in Ireland from that in England? are there not in England close boroughs, and is not the right of suffrage there confined to forty-shilling freeholders?

Emmet.—If I were an Englishman I should be discontented, and therefore cannot suppose that putting Ireland on a footing with England would content the people of this country; if, however, you have a mind to try a partial experiment, for the success of which I would not answer, you must consider how many are the close boroughs and large towns which contribute to the appointment of 558, and diminish in the same proportion the number of the close boroughs and towns which contribute to the appointment of our 300; even that would be a gain to Ireland. But that there should be no mistake or confusion of terms, let us drop the equivocal words *English constitution*, and then I answer, I would not be understood to say that the government of king, lords, and commons would be destroyed by a reform of the lower house.

Lord Castlereagh.—And don't you think that such a house could not co-exist with the government of king and lords?

Emmet.—If it would not, my lord, the eulogies that have been passed on the British constitution are very much misplaced; but I think they could all exist together if the king and lords meant fairly by the people; if they should persist in designs hostile to the people, I do believe they would be overthrown.

[It was then intimated that they had got into a theoretical discussion, and that what they wished to inquire into was facts.]

Sir J. Parnel.—Mr. Emmet, while you and the executive were philosophizing, Lord Edward Fitzgerald was arming and disciplining the people?

Emmet.—Lord Edward was a military man, and if he was doing so he probably thought that was the way in which he could be most useful to his country; but I am sure that if those with whom he acted were convinced that the grievances of the people were redressed, and that force was become unnecessary, he would have been persuaded to drop all arming and disciplining.

Mr. J. C. Beresford.—I knew Lord Edward well, and always found him very obstinate.

Emmet.—I knew Lord Edward right well, and have done a great deal of business with him, and have always found, when he had a reliance on the integrity and talents of the person he acted with, he was one of the most persuadable men alive; but if he thought a man meant dishonestly or unfairly by him, he was as obstinate as a mule.

[Many questions were then put to me relative to different papers and proceedings of the United Irish; among the rest, John Sheares's proclamation was mentioned with considerable severity. I took that opportunity of declaring that neither the execution of John Sheares, nor the obloquy that was endeavoured to be cast on his memory, should prevent my declaring that I considered John Sheares a very honourable and humane man.]

Mr. French.—Mr. Emmet, can you point out any way of inducing the people to give up their arms?

Emmet.—Redressing their grievances, and no other.

Lord Castlereagh.—Mr. Emmet, we are unwillingly obliged to close this examination by the sitting of the House.

Emmet.—My lord, if it be the wish of the committee, I will attend it any other time.

Lord Castlereagh.—If we want you, then, we shall send for you.

After the regular examination was closed, I was asked by many of the members whether there were many persons of property in the union. I answered that there was immense property in it. They acknowledged there was great personal property in it, but wished to know was there much landed property in it. I answered there was. They asked me was it fee-simple. To that I could give no answer. The attorney-general said there was in it many landlords who had large tracts of land, and felt *their* landlords to be great grievances. I admitted that to be the fact. They asked me had we provided any form of government. I told them we had a provisional government for the instant, which we retained in memory; but as to any permanent form of government, we thought that, and many other matters relating to the changes which would become necessary, were not proper objects for our discussion, but should be referred to a committee chosen by the people.

They did not ask me what the provisional government was.

THOMAS ADDIS EMMET.

We now come to a transaction which involves the character of a great Whig lawyer, namely, William Conyngham Plunket; and it behoves us in dealing with it to steer clear of angry commentaries and criticisms on his conduct in regard to T. A. Emmet, and to cite official authorities for any accounts given of this transaction and its results. I allude to his conduct in parliament during Emmet's imprisonment in August, 1798, in relation to an advertisement which appeared in two of the morning newspapers, complaining of the garbled reports that had been published in the government newspapers, of the evidence of Messrs. Emmet, O'Connor, and Macneven before the secret committees.

The only reports that exist of the proceedings in parliament in 1798 are those which are given in the newspapers of the day, except in the case of the Union debates, when important speeches are found separately published. I prefer taking the report of the proceedings in the Irish House of Commons, on the 27th of August, from a government paper of that time, and therefore I make use of "The Freeman's Journal" of the 28th August, 1798.

The Hon. Francis Hutchinson called attention to an advertisement of three of the state prisoners (Emmet, O'Connor, and Macneven), in "The Hibernian Journal" and "Saunders's News Letter." He said: "That

advertisement, whether considered as a libel on that house of parliament, or as a manifesto exciting rebellion, was one of the most daring and insolent compositions he had ever read." He moved that the printers of the two papers be ordered to attend at the bar of the House the following day.

Mr. Barrington seconded the motion. He said it had his fullest concurrence. The insolence of the publication could not be described, nor the extent of its mischievous tendency calculated.

Lord Castlereagh admitted fully the flagitious nature of the advertisement, but trusted parliament would leave with the executive the conduct of this business, and the vindication of its authority.

Mr. Plunket said: "He reprobated in the strongest terms the publication which had been read to the House by the honourable gentleman who had proposed the motion then before the House," and described it to be "a species of proclamation or manifesto couched in the most libellous and insolent language, and proceeding from three men who were signal instances of the royal mercy to all the opened and concealed traitors of the country; urging to rebellion and to the aid of a French invasion, calling upon their friends to cast from them all fear of having been detected in their treasons, and to prosecute anew those machinations which had been suspended. He felt strongly the obligation of government to observe good faith towards those men in any conditions made with them; but he also conceived it to be incumbent on the executive power to adopt such precautions as should effectually prevent the state prisoners from corrupting the public mind."

[The report of Mr. Plunket's speech on this occasion is given without any curtailment.]

Mr. Ormsby supported the motion, for the sake "of putting the business of investigation and punishment in a train to be effected."

Sir Hercules Langarish recommended the withdrawal of the motion.

Mr. Egan expressed his strongest indignation at the publication.

Mr. St. George Daly said the advertisement was of a nature to call for the notice of, and punishment by the government.

Sir H. Cavendish said the three state prisoners had violated the terms into which they had entered, and had forfeited their right to the lenity of government.

Sir J. Blaquiere, Mr. George Ogle, and Mr. Vandaleur supported the motion.

Mr. M'Naghten was of opinion that, as martial law had not ceased, the persons in question, Arthur O'Connor, Thomas Addis Emmet, and Dr. Macneven, should be immediately brought to trial and executed.

The attorney-general said he was of opinion the motion could not be withdrawn. "One of the persons signing that advertisement was certainly a very able lawyer. That person was Mr. Emmet, and he should have known—if indeed he participated in the publication of the advertisement, and had signed it—that he had thereby owned enough to disentitle himself to mercy, by refusing to disclose all which he knew of the conspiracy."

Mr. Hutchinson having re-urged his motion, the printers of the two papers in which the advertisement

appeared were ordered to appear the next day at the bar.

The following day the printers were brought to the bar, and examined. They declared the document complained of had been brought to them by Mr. Cornelius M'Loughlin, an eminent merchant of the city, and a Mr. Lyons, a schoolmaster. Major Sirr was examined. Said he had gone to Kilmainham gaol to communicate with the three state prisoners respecting the authenticity of their signatures to the advertisement; that he had at first seen Mr. A. O'Connor, and the latter declined to answer whether he signed the paper or not, till he had gone up stairs to consult some papers he had there. Then he (Major Sirr) went up alone to Messrs. Emmet and O'Connor, who immediately admitted they had authorized the publication.

The following day Messrs. M'Loughlin and Lyons were examined at the bar of the House. Lord Castlereagh on this occasion made a temperate and a judicious speech, calling on the House to leave the matter in the hands of the executive; and stating that the state prisoners had complained of reports made in the press, and not in parliament, which did misrepresent them in some respects, and justified them to some extent in the course they had taken.

The late Lord Plunket had been the early friend and fellow-student at the university of T. A. Emmet. Of that fact there can be no doubt. All the members of the family, and intimate friends and early associates of T. A. Em-

met, in America and Ireland, with whom I have been in communication, are agreed on that point. The sons of T. A. Emmet, Mr. John Patten, his brother-in-law, Mr. St. John Mason, his bosom friend, Dr. Macneven—all concur in the statement, that the late Lord Plunket and T. A. Emmet had been very intimate friends in early life. Lord Plunket, in his lengthy and verbose affidavit, filed in 1811, in the Court of King's Bench, in the case of the Right Hon. W. C. Plunket *versus* Gilbert and Hodges—which will be found in the memoir of Robert Emmet—admits that he had been "intimate" with T. A. Emmet in the University of Dublin, and during the time he (W. C. Plunket) was a student at the Inns of Court in England; that he had dined once, as far as he could recollect, with T. A. Emmet at the house of his father, Dr. Emmet; but that their intercourse "and all intimacy had ceased between him and deponent," from a short time after T. A. Emmet had been called to the bar, in 1790, in consequence of the difference of their political opinions. But Lord Plunket evidently felt this averment was too strong, as it stood in this sworn declaration, without some qualification, and accordingly we find it modified thus in the concluding part of the sentence, with this addition in reference to the origin of the opposition of their political opinions "within a very short time after the said T. A. Emmet had

been called to the Irish bar" (some time in May, 1790): "For some years before the arrest and imprisonment of the said T. A. Emmet, in the year 1798, there subsisted no sort of intercourse between this deponent and the said Thomas Addis Emmet, save what arose from occasionally meeting in the streets or in the Four Courts, although this deponent was not fully apprized of the danger in which the said Thomas Addis Emmet was implicated with the party who were engaged in the political pursuits, in this country, which ended in so much public disaster."

The deponent swore, moreover, that he was personally an utter stranger to Robert Emmet, and that "he never had received the slightest or remotest obligation from Robert Emmet, or from the father, or from any one individual of the family of the said Robert Emmet."

T. A. Emmet, I have reason to believe, considered that Mr. W. C. Plunket was his friend up to the time of his arrest and imprisonment in March, 1798. But when the lives of the state prisoners were placed in some jeopardy, by the proceedings in parliament consequent on a publication in "The Hibernian Journal" on the 27th of August, 1798, on the part of T. A. Emmet, Macneven, and O'Connor, in vindication of their characters from the newspaper versions of the report which government had published, purporting to be a true and faithful version of

the revelations made by them to the privy council and the authorities, in virtue of the compact entered into between them and the government —when Mr. W. C. Plunket, in his place in the Irish House of Commons, lent his voice and the virulent advocacy of his new opinions to the assailants of those state prisoners—then, indeed, T. A. Emmet knew he had been deceived in thinking that Mr. W. C. Plunket was his friend.

Mr. St. John Mason, the nephew of Dr. Emmet's wife, in reference to the part taken in parliament by Mr. Plunket in relation to Thomas Addis Emmet, makes use of these words in his written statement to me of his reminiscences of the Emmet family, "I have heard Dr. Emmet say that he (Plunket) was an ungrateful man." That Dr. Emmet believed Mr. W. C. Plunket had been under obligations of friendship to his son, T. A. Emmet, I have no doubt. That T. A. Emmet was shocked and disgusted when he heard of the part taken by Mr. W. C. Plunket, in his place in the House of Commons, on the occasion of the proceedings in relation to the advertisement of the state prisoners, I can have no doubt.

Dr. W. J. Macneven, conjointly with T. A. Emmet, published in New York, in 1807, a work entitled "Pieces of Irish History"—the first piece is called, "Part of an Essay Towards a History of Ireland, by T. A. Emmet"—the sec-

ond is a Digest of the Popery Laws, by the Hon. Simon Butler; the third piece is an Account of the Compact entered into with the Irish Government by the State Prisoners, by Dr. W. J. Macneven. In the latter treatise, at page 162, Dr. Macneven, in reference to the advertisement, signed by T. A. Emmet, A. O'Connor, and Macneven, of the 27th of August, says:

> A tempest of folly and fury was immediately excited in the House of Commons. Blinded by their rage, the members of that honourable assembly neglected the obvious distinction between the newspapers and their report. They took to themselves the falsehoods that had been repelled. Mr. M'Naghten, and two virulent barristers, Francis Hutchinson and Conyngham Plunket, were even clamorous for having the persons who signed the refutation disposed of by a summary execution. Plunket had been the bosom intimate of Emmet—the companion of his childhood and the friend of his youth.

Plunket certainly was not "the companion of the childhood," but of the boyhood of T. A. Emmet. And on the occasion referred to by Macneven, he did not, in so many words, or in similar words to those employed by Macneven, call on the government to dispose of his former friend and his two associates "by summary execution"; but he lent his services to exasperate the government against them, and to furnish arguments to justify the proposal of another mem-

ber to hang Messrs. Emmet, O'Connor, and Macneven. He denounced their advertisement, and he falsified wilfully and deliberately the objects and intention of that advertisement, and he magnified the imprudence of it.

But with the precision which characterized everything written or said by T. A. Emmet, we find in a letter of his to Rufus King, dated the 9th of April, 1807, that when he speaks of this transaction he does not implicate Plunket in the atrocity he imputes to another member of the House of Commons; he merely says: "A proposal was made in the Irish House of Commons by Mr. M'Naghten, an Orangeman, to take us out and hang us without trial."

No doubt Emmet's disgust and indignation at the treacherous conduct of Mr. W. C. Plunket in his regard—namely, in hounding on the government to measures of severity against him and the other two state prisoners—prevented his recurring to the ungenerous conduct of that man, or so much as even making mention of the name of W. C. Plunket. And this was the line of conduct that any one acquainted with the character of T. A. Emmet would have a right to expect at his hands.

Of Mr. Plunket's conduct in relation to Robert Emmet, this is not the place to speak; ample details in regard to it will be found in the memoir of Robert Emmet. I commend the little I have

said of the conduct of the late Lord Plunket, in relation to the violation of the ties of friendship on his part in his proceedings with respect to T. A. Emmet, to the attention of an eminent and highly gifted Tory barrister, an attorney-general of a later period, on the occasion of a proposal to erect a statue to the memory of Lord Plunket. That eminent Tory barrister said for his part he would lend no hand to the accomplishment of the proposed object, if he believed there was a foundation for those reports which had been spread abroad, to the effect that he, Lord Plunket, when he was solicitor-general, had taken a course which involved violations of private friendship. The little I have said I commend likewise to the notice of the eminent Whig barristers who have subscribed their money towards the erection of this monument. Those, however, who take an interest in the completion of this subject, in all probability will feel that my observations will only have the effect of giving an additional impetus to the proposal, and an additional claim to consideration to the memory of this great political lawyer, William Conyngham Plunket.

I have now to refer to Mr. Emmet's letter, in 1807, to Rufus King, the late resident minister of the United States in London. This performance may be considered as a fair specimen

of Emmet's political writing. It was mentioned before that the state prisoners, of whom this gentleman was one, were negotiating with the government for a discharge on a condition of departing for that country, and that leave was refused in consequence of the interference of that public functionary. In 1807, Mr. King was nominated as a candidate for a seat in the assembly of the state legislature. Mr. Emmet considered Mr. King as being the author of so much injury to him, that he felt a strong desire to defeat Mr. King's election. Accordingly Emmet wrote a letter to Mr. King asking an explanation of his interference with the British government respecting the Irish state prisoners in 1798. To this no answer was given; on which Mr. Emmet wrote a second letter to that gentleman, which was intended for public consideration. It was printed in the newspapers, and was the subject of much notice at the time. It discloses various events and occurrences relative to the sufferings of himself and his friends, well worthy of perusal by the historian; and it is replete with the indignant feeling which a person of sensibility might be expected to express, who had by those events been forced to waste four of the best years of his life in prison.

Emmet's correspondence with Mr. Rufus King, in 1807, in which the characteristics of his mind are exhibited in a clearer light than any

other of his letters which have fallen under the author's observations, will be found well deserving of attention.

Two remarkable letters of T. A. Emmet, dated the 4th and 9th April, 1807, were addressed to Mr. Rufus King, in reference to the communication of that gentleman, when American minister at the court in London, to one of the Irish state prisoners, of which the following is a copy:

TO HENRY JACKSON, ESQ.

Brighton, 23rd August, 1799.

SIR—I ought to inform you that I really have no authority to give or refuse permission to you or any other foreigner to go to the United States, the admission and residence of strangers in that country being a matter that, by a late law,[1] exclusively belongs to the president. It is true that the government of this country, in the course of the last year, in consequence of my interference, gave me assurance that a particular description of persons in Ireland, who it was understood were going to the United States, should not be allowed to proceed without our consent: this restraint would doubtless be withdrawn in favour of individuals against whose emigration I should not object; and I conclude that it is upon this supposition that you have taken the trouble to communicate to me your desire to go and reside in the United States. Without presuming to form an opinion on the subject of the late disturbances in Ireland, I entertain a distinct one in rela-

[1] The Alien Law.

tion to the political situation of my own country. In common with others, we have felt the influence of the changes that have successively taken place in France, and unfortunately a portion of our inhabitants has erroneously supposed that our civil and political institutions, as well as our national policy, might be improved by a close imitation of France. This opinion, the propagation of which was made the duty and became the chief employment of the French agents residing among us, created a more considerable division among our people, and required a greater watchfulness and activity from the government, than could beforehand have been apprehended.

I am sorry to make the remark, and shall stand in need of your candour in doing so, that a large proportion of the emigrants from Ireland, and especially in the middle states, has upon this occasion arranged themselves on the side of the malcontents. I ought to except from this remark most of the enlightened and well-educated Irishmen who reside among us, and with a few exceptions I might confine it to the indigent and illiterate, who, entertaining an attachment to freedom, are unable to appreciate those salutary restraints without which it degenerates into anarchy. It would be injustice to say that the Irish emigrants are more national than those of other countries, yet, being a numerous though very minor portion of our population, they are capable, from causes it is needless now to explain, of being generally brought to act in concert, and under artful leaders may be, as they have been, enlisted in mischievous combinations against our government. This view leads me to state to you without reserve the

hesitation that I have felt in your case; on the other hand we cannot object to the acquisition of inhabitants from abroad, possessing capital and skill in a branch of business that, with due caution, may without risk of difficulty, and with public as well as private advantage be established among us; but, on the other hand, if the opinions of such inhabitants are likely to throw them into the class of malcontents, their fortune, skill, and consequent influence, would make them tenfold more dangerous, and they might become a disadvantage instead of a benefit to our country. You must be sensible that I possess no sufficient means of forming an opinion respecting your sentiments, but the motives which lead me to interfere with your government to restrain the emigration of the persons above alluded to, oblige me to observe due caution on the present occasion; at the same time, I desire not to act with illiberality, and should be unwilling to bring upon my country the slightest imputation of inhospitality. What Mr. Wilson[1] has written, so far as it goes, is satisfactory; and on the whole I have concluded after this unreserved communication, which I hope will be received with the same candour as it is made, to inform you, authorizing you to make use of the information, that I withdraw every objection that may be supposed to stand in the way of your being permitted to go to the United States, adding only, that you may carry with you an unbiassed mind, may find the state of the country, as I believe you will, favourable to your views of business, and its government deserving your attachment.

[1] The American consul in Dublin.

I must beg your excuse for the great delay which has occurred in sending you this answer, which, I assure you, has risen from other causes than the want of due respect to your letters.

With great consideration, I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

RUFUS KING.

LETTER OF THOMAS ADDIS EMMET TO RUFUS KING, ESQ.

New York, 4th April, 1807.

Sir—From certain paragraphs in "The Evening Post," I apprehend that it may become necessary for me to obtrude myself on the public. As in that event I should wish to derive some credit from the character of my adversary, I request to be informed whether you purpose submitting to the world any explanation of your interference with the British government, respecting the Irish state prisoners in the year 1798.

I put the question in this way, because I have not the honour of any personal acquaintance with you, because I intend that everything which may pass between you and me on this subject shall be public, and because I have been informed that private applications for an explanation of that transaction have been heretofore made to you by some of my fellow-sufferers from your conduct, and that you did not think fit to favour them with a reply.

I am, Sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

THOMAS ADDIS EMMET.

LETTER OF THOMAS ADDIS EMMET TO RUFUS KING, ESQ.

New York, 9th April, 1807.

Sir—From your silence on the subject of my letter of the 4th inst., I presume that I am not to be honoured with a reply. Perhaps this may be owing to my temerity in addressing him whom Mr. Coleman calls "the first man in the country." Of the height to which your friends exalt, or wish to exalt you, I confess I was not aware when I rashly ventured to question the propriety of some part of your past conduct. I thought that in this country you had many equals, and I protest I imagined that Mr. Jefferson, for instance, was your superior. You will, sir, however, I hope, excuse my ignorance in this respect, and attribute it to the circumstance of my being an alien, and of course not yet sufficiently acquainted with the local politics of this country.

Though you, sir, have not honoured me with your notice, I have been abundantly honoured by your friends; and yet, extraordinary as it may appear, I mean to pay little attention to their assiduities, but to envelope myself in dignity like your own. As far as they have attempted to attack my character, I shall leave it to be defended by others, or rather to defend itself. Not that I affect to be insensible of the value of public opinion—but in truth, sir, in the present pressure of professional business, I have not time to do justice both to you and to myself, and I think it of infinitely more importance to the community, in the existing crisis, to make known what you are than what I am. You are the candidate for public favour, and

your conduct is the proper subject of public inquiry. Permit me, however, sir, before I enter upon that interesting topic, to make a few general observations touching myself. Mr. Coleman has brought forward some extracts from the reports of the secret committee in Ireland; I think it more than probable that he was not himself in possession of these documents—from whom then did he receive them? There is no person in this country more likely to have them than the gentleman who was at the time the resident minister at London. When you handed them to him, perhaps your memory might have served you to state, that as soon as those reports appeared in the public prints, Dr. Macneven, Mr. O'Connor, and myself, at that time state prisoners, by an advertisement to which we subscribed our names, protested against the falsehood and inaccuracy of those reports; for which we were remitted to close custody in our rooms for upwards of three months, and a proposal was made in the Irish House of Commons by Mr. M'Naghten, an Orangeman, to take us out and hang us without trial! You might also, perhaps, have recollected (for it has been published) that, while we were in this situation, other state calumnies accidentally reached the ears of one of our fellow-sufferers in another prison, who wrote a letter to the editor of "The Courier" in London, for the purpose of contradicting them, and enclosed a copy of his letter to Lord Castlereagh. Upon this Mr. Secretary Cooke was sent to inform him that if he published the contradiction he should be hanged; to that he replied he was ready to meet the event; upon which Mr. Cooke told him, that since he was in-

different about his own life, he must know that if he persevered the whole system of courts-martial, massacre, and horror, should be renewed throughout the country. By that menace he was effectually restrained.

Had you thought of mentioning those things, you might have jocularly added that though these statements might serve some present party purposes, it was rather more unfair to judge of us by the calumnies of the Irish government than it would be to judge of Mr. Jefferson and his friends by the editorial articles in "The Evening Post." The weapons you are using have been tried in Ireland among my friends and my enemies, where everything was minutely known, and they failed of effect. If I had ever done anything mean or dishonourable—if I had abandoned or compromised my character, my country, or my cause—I should not be esteemed and beloved in Ireland, as I am proud to know I am; I should not enjoy the affection and respect of my republican countrymen in America, as you, sir, and your friends confess I do.

It would not be in the power of one who had departed from the line of his duty in their and his common country, by simply expressing to them his sentiments of you, to do you such an essential injury as I am accused of having committed.

Another charge made against me is, that I am an alien, interfering in the politics of this country. Be it so for a moment, and let me ask why is it that I am an alien in this my adopted country at this day? Because, in consequence of your interference, I was prevented from coming to it in 1798, and from being

naturalized upwards of three years ago. Supposing, then, that I should refrain from intermeddling with politics in every other case, where you are concerned I feel myself authorized to exercise the rights of a citizen as far as by law I may; for you know it is an established rule of equity and good sense that no man shall be benefited by his own wrong. But how do I come forward? Not as a citizen, but as a witness. Allow me to ask you, if I possessed a knowledge of facts which could prove Mr. Jefferson guilty of robbery or a cheat, and unfit to be trusted with power, would you think me culpable if, notwithstanding my alienage, I made them known to the public, to prevent their being deceived and misled? And shall I not be permitted, because in consequence of your very misconduct I am not a citizen, to testify to facts which will prove you unfit to be entrusted in this country with any kind of delegated power? Whether Peter Porcupine or Mr. Carpenter ever went through the forms of naturalization, I know not; but perhaps they might both be safely considered as aliens—and yet I have never heard any of your friends censure their interference in the politics of America. I do not mention those gentlemen as my models, nor propose their example as my vindication, but I wish to show the pliability of those principles which are to be erected into a barrier against me.

As a witness then, sir, I come forward to testify, not to my countrymen, but to the electors of this city, to the whole of the United States, if you should ever aspire to govern them, and I now present you with my evidence.

In the summer of 1798, after the attempt of the people of Ireland for their emancipation had been completely defeated—after every armed body had been dispersed or had surrendered, except a few men that had taken refuge in the mountains of Wicklow—while military tribunals, house-burnings, shootings, torture, and every kind of devastation were desolating and overwhelming the defenceless inhabitants, some of the state prisoners then in confinement entered into a negotiation with the Irish ministers for effecting a general amnesty; and as an inducement offered, among other things not necessary to the examination of your conduct, to emigrate to such country as might be agreed upon between them and the government. When I consented to this offer, for one (and it was the case with the great majority), I solemnly declare that I was perfectly apprised that there were no legal grounds discovered upon which to proceed against me. I further knew that the crown-solicitor had, in answer to the inquiries of my friends, informed them that there was no intention of preferring a bill of indictment against me. So much for the personal considerations by which I might have been actuated; and now, sir, to return.

The offer was accepted; the bloody system was stopped for a time, and was not renewed until after your interference, and after the British ministry had resolved openly to break its faith with us. On our part we performed our stipulations with the most punctilious fidelity, but in such a manner as to preserve to us the warmest approbation of our friends, and to excite the greatest dissatisfaction in our ene-

mies. Government soon perceived that on the score of interest it had calculated badly, and had gained nothing by the contract. It was afraid of letting us go at large to develop and detect the misrepresentations and calumnies that were studiously set afloat, and had therefore, I am convinced, determined to violate its engagements, by keeping us prisoners as long as possible. How was this to be done? In the commencement of our negotiation Lord Castlereagh declared, as a reason for our acceding to government's possessing a negative on our choice, that it had no worse place in view for our emigration than the United States of America. We had made our election to go there, and called upon him to have our agreement carried into execution. In that difficulty, you, sir, afforded very effectual assistance to the faithlessness of the British cabinet. On the 16th of September, Mr. Marsden, then under-secretary, came to inform us that Mr. King had remonstrated against our being permitted to emigrate to America. This astonished us all, and Dr. Macneven very plainly said that he considered this as a mere trick between Mr. King and the British government. This Mr. Marsden denied, and on being pressed to know what reason Mr. King could have for preventing us, who were avowed republicans, from emigrating to America, he significantly answered, "Perhaps Mr. King does not desire to have republicans in America." Your interference was then, sir, made the pretext of detaining us for four years in custody, by which very extensive and useful plans of settlement within these states were broken up. The misfortunes which you brought upon the objects of

your persecution were incalculable. Almost all of us wasted four of the best years of our lives in prison. As to me, I should have brought along with me my father and his family, including a brother, whose name perhaps you even will not read without emotions of sympathy and respect. Others nearly connected with me would have come partners in my emigration. But all of them have been torn from me. I have been prevented from saving a brother, from receiving the dying blessings of a father, mother, and sister, and from soothing their last agonies by my cares—and this, sir, by your unwarrantable and unfeeling interference.

Your friends, when they accuse me of want of moderation in my conduct towards you, are wonderfully mistaken. They do not reflect, or know, that I have never spoken of you without suppressing (as I do now) personal feelings that rise up within me, and swell my heart with indignation and resentment. But I mean to confine myself to an examination of your conduct as far as it is of public importance.

The step you took was unauthorized by your own government. Our agreement with that of Ireland was entered into on the 29th of July; your prohibition was notified to us on the 16th of September. Deduct seven days for the two communications between Dublin and London, and you had precisely forty-two days, in the calms of summer, for transmitting your intelligence to America and receiving an answer. As you had no order, then, what was the motive of your unauthorized act? I cannot positively say, but I will tell you my conviction. The British ministry had resolved to de-

tain us prisoners contrary to their plighted honour; and you, sir, I fear, lent your ministerial character to enable them to commit an act of perfidy, which they would not otherwise have dared to perpetrate. Whether our conduct in Ireland was right or wrong—you have no justification for yours. The constitution and laws of this country gave you no power to require of the British government that it should violate its faith, and withdraw from us its consent to the place we had fixed upon for our voluntary emigration. Neither the president nor you were warranted to prevent our touching these shores; though the former might, under the Alien Act, have afterwards sent us away if he had reason to think we were plotting anything against the United States. I have heard something about the law of nations; but you are too well acquainted with that law not to know that it has no bearing on this subject. Our emigration was voluntary, and the English government had, in point of justice, no more to do with it than to signify that there was no objection to the place of residence we had chosen.

Another circumstance which compels me to believe a collusive league between you, in your capacity of resident minister from America, and the cabinet of St. James's, is the very extravagant and unwarrantable nature of your remonstrance, which, had the ministry been sincere towards us, they could not possibly have overlooked. If they had intended to observe their compact, you, sir, would have been very quickly made to feel the futility of your ill-timed application. You would have been taught that it was a matter of mere

private arrangement between government and us, with which you had no more to do than the minister of Denmark, Sweden, Portugal, or any other neutral power. What inference ought fairly to be made from the facts I have stated, every man must decide for himself. On me they have forced a conviction, which, if you can shake it, I shall much more gladly forego than I state it here, that in the instance alluded to you degraded the dignity and independence of the country you represented, you abandoned the principles of its government and its policy, and you became the tool of a foreign state, to give it a colourable pretext for the commission of a crime. If so, is it fit that you should hereafter be intrusted with any kind of delegated authority? What motives you may have had for that conduct, if in truth it was yours, I cannot undertake to say. Mr. Marsden seemed to doubt whether you wished for republicans in America; and I shrewdly suspect he spoke what the British ministry thought of your politics.

Perhaps it may be said that you were yourself deceived by those very calumnies of which I have complained. I sincerely wish I could believe that such were the fact—but observe this argument. We contradicted the misstatements of the committees of the lords and commons of Ireland, by an advertisement written in prison, signed by our names, and published on the 27th of August. It must have reached London on the 1st or 2nd of September; your remonstrance must have been made on or before the 12th, for it was communicated to us on the 16th. The effect produced by our advertisement was electrical, and the debate

which it caused on the very evening of its appearance, in the Irish House of Commons, was remarkable. As you doubtless read the newspapers of the day these facts could not have been unknown to you. Why then should you be deceived by representations which we had recently contradicted under circumstances so extraordinary? Mr. King, did you enter so deeply into the revolution of your country as to implicate your life in the issue of its fortunes? From the strong attachment of your political friends, I presume you were a distinguished leader in those eventful times—if not, you had certainly read their history. Did you remember the calumnies which had been thrown out by British agents against the most upright and venerable patriots of America? Did you call to mind the treatment which had been given, in South Carolina, to Governor Gabsden, to General Rutherford, Colonel Isaacs, and a number of others who had surrendered to that very Lord Cornwallis with whom, through his ministers, we negotiated; and that those distingished characters were, in violation of their capitulation and the rights of parole, sent to St. Augustine, as we were afterwards to Fort George? How then is it possible that you could have been a dupe to the misrepresentations of the British government?

These remarks I address, with all becoming respect, to "the first man in the country"; yet in fact, sir, I do not clearly see in what consists your superiority over myself. It is true you have been a resident minister at the court of St. James, and if what I have read in the public prints be true, and if you be apprized of my near relationship and family connection

with the late Sir John Temple, you must acknowledge that your interference, as resident minister at the court of St. James, against my being permitted to emigrate to America, is a very curious instance of the caprice of fortune. But let that pass. To what extent I ought to yield to you for talents and information is not for me to decide. In no other respect, however, do I feel your excessive superiority. My private character and conduct are, I hope, as fair as yours; and even in those matters which I consider as trivial, but upon which aristocratic pride is accustomed to stamp a value, I should not be inclined to shrink from competition. My birth certainly will not humble me by the comparison; my paternal fortune was probably much greater than yours; the consideration in which the name I bear was held in my native country was as great as yours is ever likely to be, before I had an opportunity of contributing to its celebrity. As to the amount of what private fortune I have been able to save from the wreck of calamity, it is unknown to you or to your friends; but two things I will tell you—I never was indebted, either in the country from which I came nor in any other in which I have lived, to any man, further than the necessary credit for the current expenses of a family; and am not so circumstanced that I should tremble "*for my subsistence*" at the threatened displeasure of your friends. So much for the past and the present—now for the future. Circumstances which cannot be controlled have decided that my name must be embodied into history. From the manner in which even my political adversaries, and some of my cotemporary historians, unequivocally hos-

tile to my principles, already speak of me, I have the consolation of reflecting, that when the falsehoods of the day are withered and rotten I shall be respected and esteemed. You, sir, will probably be forgotten when I shall be remembered with honour; or if, peradventure, your name should descend to posterity, perhaps you will be known only as the recorded instrument of part of *my* persecution, sufferings, and misfortunes.

I am, Sir, &c.,

THOMAS ADDIS EMMET.

Mr. Rufus King, by one of those strange freaks and accidents of fortune which are of such frequent occurrence in American political life and strife, suddenly emerged from the obscurity naturally suited to mediocrity of talent, slenderness of intellectual provision, smallness of views, and dearth of enlarged ideas, liberal sentiments, and generous impulses, and became minister of the United States at the court of St. James, bringing nothing with him to his great post but his regal name, and some ridiculous pretensions to affinity with nobility and royalty of Norman origin, to contribute to its dignity. The poor, vain, new man, of the young republic growing up a giant, forgot himself, or rather forgot what was due to his position, and to the interests and character of the institutions of his country; and, carried away by the predominant influences of surrounding aristocratic tastes and feelings, de-

livered himself up to the Toryism in which he lived and moved in London, affecting even a preference for monarchical institutions over those of his own land; and turned the little, brief authority with which he was invested to the account of that old *régime* of English Toryism against the people of Ireland, who had been oppressed and driven into rebellion by it. He remonstrated with the British government against men suspected of republican principles being sent to the republican land which he represented at the court of St. James. A grievous wrong—a prolonged imprisonment of upwards of three years—was the result of this uncalled-for interference of Mr. Rufus King to the state prisoners confined in Ireland. Little did Mr. Rufus King imagine then, in the plenitude of his power and authority as minister to the court of St. James, that one of those Irish rebels "vehemently suspected" of holding republican opinions—a broken-down man—a mere Irish rebel, but still a person of some talents and commendable qualities, of the name of Emmet—at the distance of eight years from the date of that act of Mr. Rufus King—should be found able and ready to drag that gentleman before the bar of public opinion in America—should be found rising up in power, influence, respect, and honour to repay the gratuitous injury that had been inflicted on him and his associates. T. A.

Emmet indeed repaid the wrong done him by Mr. Rufus King with a vengeance. He drove back the ex-minister to obscurity, brought the candidate for a new office of great dignity into disrepute, banished him from public life, and consigned him to obloquy for the remainder of his days. For eight years the remembrance of the wrongs done by Mr. Rufus King to the state prisoners of Fort George was treasured up in the mind of T. A. Emmet, and at last found expression, and a fitting opportunity for it, in those letters I have just quoted of T. A. Emmet.